

2947

2mas

JPRS: 2947

11 July 1960

MAIN FILE

HISTORICAL TYPES OF COMMUNITY AMONG PEOPLE:

CLAN, TRIBE, NATIONALITY, NATION

- USSR -

by A. A. Satybalov

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

19990611 142

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT /
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

JPRS: 2947

CSO: 3951-N

HISTORICAL TYPES OF COMMUNITY AMONG PEOPLE:
CLAN, TRIBE, NATIONALITY, NATION

[Following is a translation of the monograph
entitled above by A. A. Satybalov, Leningrad,
1959, pages 3-55.]

Table of Contents

General Remarks	2
Forms and Types of Human Communities.	3
The Clan-Tribal Community	16
The Category of Nationality and a Brief History of its Study	27
Concerning the Relationship among the Categories "Nationality," "People," and "National Group" . . .	36
Bourgeois and Socialist Nations. Socialist National- ties and Socialist Nations	40
Appendices	
Resume of Data on the Size, Territory, and Languages of the Peoples of the USSR	53
Bibliography.	70

This book examines the concept of a "community of human beings," the historical process of the development of types of human communities (clan, tribe, nationality, nation), the relations among these categories, and the peculiarities of the formation of nations in the present era. The prospects for the development of nationalities and nations in the period of socialism are elucidated on the basis of an extensive amount of factual data on the history of the peoples of the USSR.

The inaccuracies and errors to be found in the literature on this subject are subjected to criticism in this book.

The book is intended for instructors, graduate students, and students in the humanities departments of universities and other higher educational institutions, and for workers and students in the system of Party political education.

General Remarks

As is generally known, Historical Materialism, in contradistinction to Idealism, explains the process of the formation of the clan, the tribe, the nationality, and the nation on the basis of the laws of development of the mode of production of material values.

This basic thesis of the Materialist concept of history is reflected in the work of progressive scientists throughout the world -- ethnographers, historians, and philosophers studying the phenomena of social life -- and leads to positive scientific results. A good deal has been accomplished by Soviet philosophers as regards the correct interpretation and further development of the basic principles of Historical Materialism. However, certain principles of the laws governing the development of various forms of human community have been inaccurately and even erroneously interpreted in the philosophical, historical, and ethnographic literature. Owing to this fact, certain new problems have been incorrectly treated in several works. An especially large number of shortcomings and controversial questions are to be found in articles and monographs on the problem of the formation of the nationality and the history

of various peoples. In particular, they have regarded the small nationalities of the USSR as tribes, while the consolidation of small nationalities into one larger nationality has been considered as a process of the formation of a nation. There is a denial of the qualitative difference between the concepts of "socialist nation" and "socialist nationality," which leaves unclarified the question: At what stage of social development does a socialist nationality become a socialist nation? There is also a denial of the economic community of persons grouped together in a nationality, not only in the era of feudalism but also in that of capitalism. There is no unanimous opinion as to the relationship of such categories as a people [narod], a nationality [narodnost'], a nation [natsiya], and national group [natsional'nost']. And there are several other shortcomings (to be discussed infra) in the process of setting forth the basic principles of Historical Materialism and the formation of a community of human beings in their historical sequence: clan, tribe, nationality, and bourgeois and socialist nations.

Forms and Types of Human Communities

The clan, the tribe, the nationality, and the nation are historical types of human communities.

Human beings not only differ from one another, but also have common traits typical of various groups, classes, peoples, and mankind in general. This applies not only to human beings but to all of the phenomena of nature and society: there is a community (unity) characterizing the existence of a universal relationship among them. Thus difference necessarily presupposes the existence of community, and vice versa. In view of this fact, the two categories (community and difference) must be considered in close connection with each other.

The criteria defining the community and difference of human beings are divided into two large groups: the natural, and the socio-historical. The criteria in the first group include community and difference of sex, age, race, etc.

The natural forms of community and difference among

human beings are of great importance; but they do not define the course of the socio-economic development of society. Moreover, their social meaning depends upon the mode of production. For example, the position, role, and importance of women in the feudal, capitalist, and socialist formations are different. It is not a matter of accident that in the capitalist countries the women's and youth organizations are a part of class-wide political organizations and that there is no single classless organization of women or youth.

The division of society into men and women, and the older and younger generation, will exist at all stages of social development; but the character of the relationships among them changes in accordance with the change in the mode of production. Thus in the USSR and the other countries of socialism, very favorable conditions have been created for the all-around development of women and children.

Race differences are to be distinguished from the other criteria referring to the natural history group by virtue of the duration of their existence; and they are less marked. The time will come when present race differences will have disappeared, and anthropological differences will be of a very individual character.

The elimination of the exploitation of man by man, the economic and cultural development of formerly depressed peoples, and the strengthening of economic and cultural ties among the peoples of the world are creating very favorable conditions for the elimination of race prejudice, strengthening friendship among peoples, and bringing them closer together in all aspects of life. Thus in the period of socialism, representatives of different races socialize and intermarry much more frequently than in the feudal age or even under capitalism.

In the USSR, where the exploiter classes have been eliminated together with the causes of race prejudice, and where favorable conditions have been created for the all-around development of all citizens without regard for race, Soviet men and women usually do not notice race differences, or else they attribute no importance to them.

Race problems are especially acute in the United States, inhabited by white, Negro and other races. A program of stirring up hatred for the so-called "inferior"

races plays an important role in the domestic and foreign policy of the imperialists. Tremendous sums of money are spent, within the country, on the elaboration and propagandizing of the theory of the superiority of the "Aryan" race, not only over races but over other groups of whites.

The Aryan theory has ramifications in the form of the Teutonic, Anglo-Saxon, and Keltic race theory. This theory denies the existence of objective laws of social development. The ideologues of this theory try to attribute the wealth and industrial and cultural development of the European countries to the inherent physical, moral, psychic, and mental superiority of the "Aryan" race over all other "lower" races. Slavery, poverty, submissiveness, oppression, and other social phenomena are explained as due to the "quality" of the race. In every case where the success of the "Aryan" race is mixed with failure, the racists explain this as due to the lack of a struggle for race purity, zealously opposing mixed marriages. The historical facts completely refute the basic premises of this inconsistent and unscientific theory, built on a one-sided interpretation and distortion of historicoo-linguistic, social, and biological facts.

It suffices to pose the simplest problems before the racists, to see that they are unable to come up with satisfactory answers. For example, how does one explain the fact that Chinese culture is more ancient than the culture of Germany? Answer: the achievements of the ancient Chinese are due to the penetration of Aryan blood. But why, since the Chinese belong to the yellow race and not to the white? Why did the Aryans of this same period not have such a high culture? How can we explain the fact that with respect to the production of certain commodities, modern-day socialist China has already overtaken and surpassed capitalist Britain, while the Chiang Kai-shekists have not? If this is explained by the penetration of "Aryan" blood, in what respect does this "Aryan" blood differ from existing groups of human blood in general? There is no answer, and there can be none, since there is no distinctive all-conquering Aryan blood.

The racists have erected their theory on a distortion of numerous historical facts:

1. The industrial successes of the West in the 19th

Century, due to the higher capitalist mode of production, are considered by them in isolation from the laws of the development of social formations. Therefore, the rapid industrial development of several European countries as compared with the countries of the feudal East, has been attributed by the racists to properties of blood.

2. They have made use of the legend to the effect that India and Iran were conquered by tall, fair-haired, powerful conquerors who called themselves Aryans.

3. They have utilized the actual similarity between the Indo-Iranian languages and the European languages, including the Slavic tongues.

4. They have taken advantage of the lack of investigation of the old meaning of the modern Indo-Iranian word "ari" ("ariya"), signifying "noble", and of the labelling of ancient peoples as Aryacs, Aryans, Anaryacs, and Anti-aryacs by ancient Greek historians. It is only recently that these problems have been investigated (V. V. Struve, "The Aryan Problem." "Sovetskaya Etnografiya," Vol VI-VII, 1947, pp 117-124) and the Turkish character of the terms "Aryac" and "Aryan" was discovered. (A. A. Satybalov and A. I. Popov, "Aryac- Aryan," "Vestnik LGU" ✓ Herlad of Leningrad State University ✓, 1956, No 8, 2.). In this connection, groups have been discovered among the modern Turkish-speaking peoples which are called "Aryac" or "Aryan" in the sense of "people from the other side"; i.e., people living beyond certain geographic borders (trans-riverine, tramontane, etc.).

5. A considerable role has been played by the prejudices of the anthropologists and the fact that the anthropologists of the West are still not equipped with a scientific method for investigation social and natural phenomena; the method of Dialectical Materialism. Eclecticism, metaphysics, and Idealism predominate; and they correspond to the interests of future and present aggressors.

It is not a matter of accident that experience has very rapidly disclosed the unscientific and utilitarian nature of the racists' theory. Thus the theoreticians of Fascism have frequently changed their "principles" in order to bring them into line with the plans of the imperialists. When class relations become aggravated and it is necessary

to justify repressions against the workers, the race theory emphasizes the superiority of the aristocratic, high-born, ruling strata. When, however, preparations are being made for an attack on one's closest neighbors, there is a hue and cry about the superiority of one's own nation as a whole. And when there is a joint attack with other imperialist powers -- e.g., against the Arabs -- there is talk of the superiority of the "Aryan" race as a whole.

And they even change their anthropological "principles." For example, if the ancient Aryans were fair-haired, blue-eyed, etc., then their "pure-blooded" descendants should also have these characteristics. However, Arthur de Gobineau (1816-1888), author of the "Essay on the Inequality of Human Races" (M. A. de Gobineau, "Essai sur l'Inegalite des Races Humaines," Vols I-II, Paris, 1853) who has been rightly credited with the detailed elaboration of the principles of the theory of the superiority of the "Aryan" race over other groups of the white race, does not describe the external appearance of the Aryans in a completely precise manner (sometimes they are dark-eyed, sometimes blue-eyed, etc.). It seems that the author himself, like most Frenchmen, had dark eyes.

The German racist, R. Wagner, and his son-in-law, Houston S. Chamberlain, an Englishman, pursued the theory of Arthur de Gobineau on German soil, and put forth the idea of the superiority of the Teutonic race. The German racists made the following characteristics the exclusive property of the Aryan race: tall stature, light blue eyes, fair hair, long skull, innate nobility, firmness of character, and other moral and psychological traits.

Wilhelm II, captivated by the idea of the superiority of his race, wanted to draw up a race map of Germany in order to bring out the percentage of Aryan elements; but the racial heterogeneity proved so great that, for example, in the duchy of Baden there was not a single person of purely "Nordic" type. It became necessary to abandon the project.

Our literature tells us that in the pre-fascist period Max von Gruber, vice-president of the Warsaw Academy of Sciences, wrote: "I got a close look at Hitler. His face and head show that he is of a bad race. He is a

mongrel. The forehead is low and receding, the nose irregular, the cheekbones wide, the eyes small, and the hair dark." ("The Race Problem and Society. A Selection of Translations from the French." M, IL / Foreign Literature Publishing House, 1957, p 9. (Introduction by M. S. Plisetskiy.)

In view of the sharp dissimilarity between the external appearance of the "pure" Aryan and the appearance of Hitler, it became necessary, when Hitler came to power, to declare that all of the writings about the anthropological traits of the "Aryan" race were nonsense. All that was left was the description of psychological and moral traits, which have no direct relationship to race; i.e., they are not due to it. Thus the race theory was emptied of everything that had anything to do with race. The criteria of the so-called "European race" also proved to be fabrications. Among the German Europeans were found many persons resembling prominent Aryans and other representatives of the white race. In view of this, the fascists classified as representatives of the "European race" those whose geneology showed the presence of relatives in the ascending line who were of the Jewish faith. But one should not confuse religion, nation, and race. Within one race there may be representatives of various nations and religions. Conversely, representatives of different races and nations may have the same religion.

In its turn, a nation may be broken down into different groups on the basis of the religious criterion. For example, the Chinese, Japanese, Arabs, and certain other nations are heterogeneous as regards religion.

Thus race differences, not only within one race but also among basic races, are not absolute. There is good reason why the anthropologists, in distinguishing among human beings on the basis of the color of the skin, the type of hair, etc., count from three to 60 large and small racial groups.

The anthropological traits of each new generation of a family, nationality, or nation differs somewhat from the individual, group, and general-race traits of the parents. This is due to the fact that the shape of the head, the facial features, the color of the hair and eyes, are as a rule not uniform as between man and wife, not to mention the fact that the living conditions of the children differ

somewhat from the conditions under which the parents grew up.

The relative nature of race differences is usually explained merely by the racial intermingling which takes place before and after the rise of a nation. This is true; but in this connection it should be borne in mind that the relative nature of race differences is due primarily to the community of main factors in the formation of the human being and to the predominance of the generally human characteristics in the bodily structure over race, group, and (a fortiori) individual characteristics associated with slight differences in the geographic and biological conditions of the rise and development of individual groups of human beings.

There is good reason why the progressive geneticists and anthropologists, who acknowledge man's descent from the ape [sic], compare only those general characteristics which are typical of all mankind, with the general characteristics of various groups of apes (the brain, hand, foot, musculature, etc.). Thus signs of hereditary similarity to apes are found in all peoples of the world, with no exceptions, to one degree or another. It should be noted in passing that the similarity between man and ape is so great that even the clergy have been compelled to acknowledge this similarity. But they explain it in their own way: it turns out that it was not man who descended from the ape, but the ape who was made from man, in accordance with the will of God.

For progressive scientists, the fact of man's origin from the ape is incontrovertible. The only controversies have to do with the place of origin of man, mentioned in the works of Charles Darwin and F. Engels. Some postulate that man originated in different regions, unrelated to one another; while others say he originated in one large region. In view of the fact that these disputes do not cast any doubt on the fact of man's derivation from the ape, we shall confine ourselves to a quotation from the Soviet anthropologist, M. S. Plisetskiy (M. S. Plisetskiy, "Man and His Races," M. Goskul'tprosvetizdat [State Publishing House of Literature on Culture and Education], 1956, p 54), who has written that of all opinions as to the origin of man, the one to be preferred is the famous statement of Charles Darwin:

"...it is likely that Africa was originally inhabited by now-extinct apes very close to the gorilla and the chimpanzee; and since these two species are now the closest relatives of man, the assumption that our ancient ancestors lived on the African Continent, and not on any other, acquires a certain degree of likelihood." (Charles Darwin, "The Origin of Man and Sexual Selection," "Works," Vol 5, Izd. AN SSSR [Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences USSR], 1956, p 265.)

The general human characteristics of human beings (the hand, musculature, foot, erect posture, atrophying of unnecessary organs, etc.) which distinguish them from the apes are explained by the fact that in addition to biological (continuation of the species, etc.) and geographical conditions, human existence also requires skill in the reproduction and improvement of tools for manufacturing food products and other vitally necessary things which are not found in nature in a finished form.

The hand and the entire bodily organization of the anthropoid ape changed in accordance with the task of utilizing, producing, and finally, reproducing and improving production tools. When the latter happened, man's prehistory was completed, and the history of social development commenced. A part of the natural history of man is to some degree "subordinated" to social history. For example, there appear anthropological changes due to the process of labor, concerning which F. Engels wrote, in generalizing the data of history, anthropology, and other sciences: "Thus the hand is not only an organ of labor, it is also a product of it. It is only thanks to labor -- thanks to the adaptation to new operations, to the hereditary transmission of the consequent development of the muscles, ligaments, and (over a longer period of time) bones, and to the new application of these inherited improvements to new and increasingly complex operations -- it is only thanks to all this that the human hand has achieved such a high degree of perfection... And that which has proven useful to the hand has also proven useful to the entire body, which it has served... Above all, by virtue of that law which Darwin called the law of the proportion of growth... (The essence of the law of the proportion of growth consists in the fact

change in one part of

that a change in one part of the body inevitably leads to changes in other parts.) ... At first, labor, and then articulate speech in conjunction with it, constituted the two main stimuli under the effect of which the brain of the ape was gradually transformed into a human brain which, for all its similarity to the brain of the ape, far exceeds it in size and perfection... Just as the gradual development of speech is invariably accompanied...by improvement of the organ of hearing, so the development of the brain is in general accompanied by the improvement of all the senses in their totality... The development of the brain and the senses subordinated thereto -- of an ever clearer consciousness and capacity for abstraction and reasoning -- has had a reciprocal effect on work and speech, providing them with ever more stimuli toward further development... Work begins with the fashioning of tools. But what were the most ancient tools?... They were tools for hunting and fishing, and the former was at the same time a weapon. But hunting and fishing presuppose a transition from the exclusive consumption of plant food to the consumption of meat; and this means a new and important step toward the transformation into man. Meat as a food contained in almost finished form the most important substances required by the organism for its own metabolism... But the meat diet had its most substantial effect on the brain... The use of meat as a food led to two...achievements of decisive importance: the use of fire and the domestication of animals. The former reduced even more the process of digestion...the latter increased the reserves of meat food, since together with hunting it provided a new source from which he could draw more regularly, and in addition it provided, in the form of milk and its products, a new...kind of food... Just as man taught himself to eat everything that was edible, so he taught himself to live in any climate... But the change from the uniformly warm climate of the original home country to the colder countries...created new demands upon dwellings and clothing... To hunting and animal husbandry was added agriculture, then weaving and spinning, the working of metals, pottery-making, and the use of boats. Together with trade and the crafts there finally appeared art and science; and tribes developed into nations and states."

(F. Engels, "The Dialectics of Nature," M, Gospolitizdat [State Publishing House of Political Literature], 1950, pp. 133-138.)

The experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the USSR, and then the experience of socialist building in China and other countries, have refuted in an especially convincing manner the fascist theory as to the incapacity for creative activity on the part of the "colored" races. This experience shows that it is criminal to attribute the successes of the capitalist West and the cultural backwardness of the peoples of Asia and Africa, living under conditions of a feudal society, to the superiority of the white race and the incapacity of other races. Representatives of the formerly "sluggish," "apathetic," and "lazy" race have shown themselves to be lively, energetic, enthusiastic, and competent creators of gigantic industrial enterprises, cultural and scientific institutions, and material and spiritual values accrued as a result of the replacement of the old mode of production with a new one, of their liberation from domestic and foreign exploiters, and of a rise in their material and cultural well-being. Thus the obsolete mode of production has proven worthless, as have the would-be theoreticians of racism, "floating" on the surface of the current of social phenomena and unwilling to penetrate into their essence, owing to their class blindness and bestial hatred toward the oppressed peoples for their struggle against foreign enslavers.

However, the theoreticians of racism have not laid down their poisonous weapons. Thus during the discussion of the declaration, outstanding progressive anthropologists and geneticists working on its preparation under assignment from UNESCO, they came out with all of their objections to race equality.

The history of that declaration has already been related in our special literature. ("The Race Problem and Society," pp 1-17. (Introduction by M. S. Plisetskiy.)) Briefly, it went as follows:

At its Sixth Session, the United Nations Economic and Social Council posed the problem of elaborating "a program for the dissemination of scientific facts with a view to overcoming what is usually called race prejudices."

(Ibid, p 5.) The practical implementation of this task was assigned to a special organ of the Economic and Social Council of UNESCO [sic] (the Association for the Dissemination of Education, Science, and Culture).

For purposes of accomplishing this task there was created under UNESCO a committee of anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists, which was to describe in popular language the present state of the race problem.

The first version of the declaration of the Committee of anthropologists, biologists [sic], and sociologists was published on 18 June 1950 (Ibid, pp 300-307.)

The declaration provoked both positive and negative reactions. Criticism was directed against the declaration's basically correct statements that there were no innate psychic differences in different racial groups, and that "biological investigations have confirmed the ethics of universal brotherhood, since man by virtue of an innate proclivity aspires toward cooperation." (Ibid, p 307). The last phrase in the declaration was labelled a naively humanistic tendency of the sociologists which contradicted biology.

The heads of UNESCO yielded to the reactionary criticism and reorganized the committee, so that it consisted only of biologists who were specialists in physical anthropology and genetics. The sociologists were eliminated from the committee as advocates of the naively humanistic idea of "universal brotherhood." However, even the authors of the second version of the declaration, "Race and Race Differences" (Ibid, pp 308-310), published in June 1951, noted that race differences do not provide grounds for considering some races superior and others inferior. Moreover, from a racial standpoint, all mankind has been mixed since ancient times. Therefore, one cannot speak of pure races. Likewise, one cannot regard racial mixing as a negative phenomenon. There is no scientific basis for prohibiting interracial marriages. Race differences in no way affect the psyche, language, culture, or social life. However, the declaration does not contain a criticism of racism. Moreover, it was sent for comment to anthropologists of various countries, including former racist anthropologists of Western Germany, but excluding scientists of the countries of the socialist

camp, who were not invited to participate in the preparation of either the first or the second version of the declaration.

The former Nazi "scientists" were not slow to cast doubt upon the basic and most progressive statements in the declaration. They were especially vigorous in opposing the idea of racial equality. This fact shows once again that racism will not disappear so long as there exist imperialism and the danger of predatory wars, which are due not by any means to race differences but to similarities and differences in the class position of human beings. On the other hand, the appearance of the declaration shows that a considerable part of the geneticists, anthropologists, and other scientists who are far from Marxism are beginning to free themselves of race prejudices under the influence of scientific facts, the progressive development of the countries of Asia, and the large-scale movement of the peace partisans throughout the world.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the foregoing remarks on races.

The psyche, ethics, language, poverty, wealth, and culture do not belong in the category of race and are not conditioned by it.

Racial similarities and differences are determined on the basis of external attributes of a man: the shape of the head, the color of the hair and eyes, etc.

The race traits of human beings have their beginnings in various groups of anthropoid apes from which man has developed.

Man's hand, foot, brain and other parts of the body have changed in the process of labor.

However, it does not follow from this that these anthropological changes have ceased to belong to the realm of natural history and can be categorized as socio-historical processes.

Racial mixing goes back to ancient times and leads to positive biological and social results. There are no pure races. The struggle for racial purity is a reactionary phenomenon. The elimination of the exploiter classes will put an end to race hatreds and will strengthen even further the process of rapprochement of large and small racial groups.

However, rapprochement does not mean the development of a standardized man independent of geographic, biological, and other conditions. But that sharp difference which now exists among black men, white men, and yellow men, will disappear.

Nonetheless, the natural-historical forms and types of human community must not be considered in isolation from the socio-historical forms.

The socio-historical forms of community and difference among human beings include all types of human social activity and all forms and types of social relations. However, not every socio-historic form of human community is characteristic of the clan, tribe, nationality, or nation. For example, a community of class position, religion, and state is not characteristic of the clan or tribe, or of the nationality or nation. The present-day German nation is divided into Catholics, Protestants, and nonbelievers, and lives in a system of two qualitatively different states. Of special importance is the fact that the clan, tribe, nationality, and (in particular) nation is characterized not by any one form of community, but by a totality of numerous socio-historical forms of human community. For example, community of language is a very important criterion; but it itself is conditioned by other forms of human community in the absence of which the clan, tribe, nationality, and (especially) nation are inconceivable.

In syllabi and textbooks on philosophy, the clan, tribe, nationality, and nation are called forms of human community. It would be more correct to call them socio-historical types of human community in which are generalized the common traits typical of various clans, nationalities, and nations.

It goes without saying that the socio-historical types of human community are interrelated, and that consequently they show the development of similar traits covering and concealing their distinctive characteristics. For example, owing to their methodological and class limitations, the bourgeois sociologists see only the similar traits of these forms of community; and as a result they consider a nation apart from the history of the change in the modes of production -- as a simple continuation of blood and family ties.

Historical Materialism, generalizing the data from general history, anthropology, ethnography, archeology, linguistics, and folklore, has established that:

1. The historical types of human community (clan, tribe, nationality, and nation) are not only interrelated and have something in common, but are qualitatively different.
2. The stages in the development of a socio-historic human community are governed by the history of the change in the modes of production of material values:
3. a) The clan-tribal community developed in the period of the formation of primitive modes of production;
- b) The nationality developed in the period of the dominance of slave-holding or feudalism;
- c) The nation developed in the period of capitalism.

The Clan-Tribal Community

Not only in the prerevolutionary times, but also in the Soviet Era, the literature of ethnography, history, linguistics, philosophy, and politics refers to all small peoples as tribes, and large peoples as nations. For example, at the turn of the century there was published, under the editorship of N. Ya. Marr, a "Collection of Materials for the Study of the Localities and Tribes of the Caucasus," in which every one of the peoples of the Caucasus is considered a tribe. Moreover, at the present time, in the literature of history, linguistics, and oriental studies, peoples living in the era of nomadic feudalism are classified as tribes. In newspaper articles, the present-day Kurds of Iran and the Bedouins of Arabia are regarded as tribes. This is apparently due to the fact that philosophical literature itself has not yet studied and defined the scientific term "nationality," which is now used to denote the distinctive traits of peoples living in the era of slave-holding and feudalism which have not yet succeeded in becoming nations.

But there is no justification for those authors -- and especially those philosophers -- who even after studying the category of "nationality," continue to classify as tribes those peoples with a small population. Moreover, there are no arguments to support this thesis. It may be assumed that

the basis for this affirmation is the small population of these peoples and the presence of certain vestiges of clan-tribal and primitive relations.

For example, the book, "The Socialist Nations of the USSR," published in 1955 by the Institute of the History of Philosophy, Acad. Sci. USSR, states: "...Consider, for example, the tribes and peoples of the North,..they were pitilessly exploited by merchants, speculators, czarist officials, kulaks..." ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," M, Izd. AN SSSR, 1955, p 59.)

One may ask whether, if there were kulaks in their midst, they could be considered as tribes. Moreover, in our scientific literature it has been stated repeatedly that the clan and tribe are proper only to a primitive, classless society. However, the rise of classes and the formation of nationalities must not be understood as the definitive abolition of vestiges of the primitive mode of production and of blood and family ties. In particular, vestiges are preserved to a considerable degree in the period of early feudalism among those nationalities which in their development do not pass through the stages of the slave-holding mode of production. Thus as late as the 19th Century, Dagestan and Chechen had leagues of agricultural communes which held land in common and formally did not enter into the feudal ownership of any particular prince. These leagues were of a territorial character. The members of the communes were divided into the poor peasants, the middle peasants, and the kulaks. Some of the members of the commune had their own tracts of land and a great many livestock. Moreover, they sometimes paid a tribute to the neighboring princes. The wealthy ones owned enough livestock and other resources for the individual cultivation of their land, and even purchased shares with the right of enjoyment throughout the year. The poor peasants and middle peasants organized small associations for the joint cultivation of the land and harvesting. Also, the boundaries were preserved: the land of each was worked individually, and in turn. It is significant that the communes accepted as members the representatives of all nationalities living together in one village. It is true, however, that until a certain generation they were considered as newcomers and enjoyed only limited rights.

Thus in this case only the socialized ownership of the land -- which existed by virtue of the fact that the digging of canals for protecting the land from encroachment by the princes made it extremely necessary to form a large collective -- can be considered as a vestige of the primitive mode of production.

Those peoples who, in addition to the division into poor peasants, middle peasants, and kulaks, were directly dependent upon the local prince or landowner, cannot a fortiori be called tribes. Since in the process of the class differentiation of the peasantry, the joint domiciling and work of a large number of close relatives becomes impossible, and ties of kinship lose their former significance.

Thus the presence of vestiges of the primitive mode of production and clan-tribal relations does not provide a foundation for the territorial leagues to be called tribes, if the class relations play a primary role. (In this connection it should be borne in mind that the radical (qualitative) alteration of the old begins, not with the appearance of finished elements of the new within the old, but with the domination (preponderance) of the elements of the new over the elements of the old.) Moreover, the small size of a people is not of substantive importance.

It should be remembered that V. I. Lenin wrote the following in his criticism of Mikhaylovskiy (who had postulated that the essence of the history of society consists in the fact that originally there was the family, the the family grew into the tribe, and the tribes grew into states): "Whereas it is possible to speak of the clan life in ancient Russia, there is no doubt but what by the Middle Ages, the era of the Moscow Czardom, these clan ties no longer existed; i.e., the state was based on ties which were by no means clannish, but rather local: the landowners and monasteries accepted peasants from various localities, and the communes thus formed were purely territorial associations. However, one can scarcely speak of national ties, in the strict sense of the word, at that time. The state was broken up into individual 'lands,' and frequently into principalities, preserving prominent traces of the ancient autonomy..." (V. I. Lenin, "Works," Vol 1, pp 137-138.)

On the basis of the foregoing statement of V. I. Lenin -- and, in particular, on the basis of I. V. Stalin's statement that "...a nation is not a racial or tribal community, but an historically-formed community of human beings" (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol 2, p 293.) -- certain philosophers have drawn two conclusions which, in my view are incorrect:

1. That tribes, like races, are formed not "historically" -- i.e., not in the process of social development -- but biologically.

2. That tribes, unlike nationalities or nations, have not intersocialized but have retained purity of blood and race traits.

There is no question but what sexual ties and the continuation of the species constitute a natural-historical phenomenon. But the necessity for realizing and regulating these ties and changing the forms of blood and family relations and obligations flowing from them are associated with the laws of social development. For example, the cause for the changeover from the matriarchy to the patriarchy is not to be sought in biology or anthropology, but in the history of the development of productive capacities and production relations.

Thus clan-tribal relations are formed historically; i.e., in the process of the development of society, but prior to its division into classes. Even the one simple fact that clan relations played a primary role only prior to the rise of private ownership of the basic means of production and ceased to play such a role after its development, leaves no doubt but what the tribal community, unlike the racial community, was formed in the course of social development. (This does not mean, of course, that the racial community is not associated with social development. For example, the rapprochement of present-day races is taking place thanks exclusively to social development. But these differences derive from the anthropoid apes and are anthropological and biological categories.) Apparently, in I. V. Stalin's work, "Marxism and the National Minority Problem," the word "historically" is used in a narrow sense, dating from the time of the rise of classes, the state, written language, etc.

As respects the socializing of tribes it must be noted that they were unquestionably interrelated. There were instances of military conflicts, cases of violence, adoption, and later, exchanges. (F. Engels, in his work, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," (M, Gospolitizdat, 1953, p 89), notes: "It frequently happened that individual clans, weakened because of some unusual circumstance, thus regained strength by means of mass adoption from another clan, with the agreement of the latter." But these ties did not alter the fact that the clan consisted only of near relatives with common ancestors, living and working together, since there was no private ownership of the means of production.

During the period of the breakdown of the primitive mode of production and the rise of monogamy, the family, private property, and classes, the process of mixing representatives of different clans were intensified. Near relatives were divided into rich and poor. Those without property were compelled to leave the family and seek work in other regions. Thus the "territorial leagues," consisting of persons not having ancestors in common, arose at a time when the joint work of relatives was becoming impossible thanks to the development of property inequalities among them. And, conversely, in the period of the domination of the communal mode of production the mixing of blood in no way disturbed the system of clannish ties (the matriarchy or patriarchy) of a collective working together. It is true that this mixing must have been negligible during the period when the marriage groups were divided only by generations: brothers and sisters -- immediate relatives, first cousins, second cousins, etc. -- all were considered as brothers and sisters to one another, "because they are men and women." This mixing must have been of a systematic character, when first parents and children, and then brothers and sisters, were excluded from mutual sex relations. However, even during this period there was no disturbance to the community of ancestors (fathers).

Thus the most important and decisive trait of the clan-tribal community is the collective ownership and use of tools, since it governs the other traits of the clan-tribal community: the community of ancestors, joint habitation,

community of language, community of religious rites, customs, and culture (material and spiritual). Community of ownership and use of production tools was governed by the nature of the primitive means of production.

Like their ancestors, the anthropoid apes, primitive human beings lived gregariously. The radical difference consisted in the fact that the normal existence of man (the presence of foodstuffs) depended directly upon the method of fashioning and using tools of production; and the tools of production were made and used in common. Also, labor (the joint making and use of production tools) served as the basis for the development of knowledge of objects of labor and methods of acting on them, and its social character governed the development of articulate speech. Thus all society must have realized the necessity for the reproduction of production tools and agreeing upon joint actions of the working collective for the production of foodstuffs. The ancient dances, songs, customs, and proverbs expressed this social idea of the necessity of coordinating the action of the members of the collective in the process of the joint reproduction of production tools and their use. It is not a matter of accident that the very word "society" is directly or indirectly associated with concepts close to the concept of tie, cooperation, peace, agreement, etc.

Thus the Russian word "society" is associated with such concepts as "general," "in common," "to communicate" (to combine), "in common" [repeated], "to inform" (to say), since in the absence of verbal language the action of the working collective could not have been agreed upon. (The root of this word [soglasovat'] is "glas" (golos) [voice].

Thus the joint fashioning of production tools and their collective ownership constituted an important aspect of the life of primitive human beings living in small groups in various regions.

However, the roles played by old men, children, women, and younger men in the process of collective labor were not uniform; i.e., there was a natural division of labor. Because of this, the stages in the development of blood and family relations depended upon the development of labor relations. For example, it is historically known that

at the early stage in the formation, kinship was considered to pass through the maternal line (matriarchy) -- not only because sexual relations were promiscuous and children were more attached to the women, who fed them with the milk from their breasts, than to the men, but also because the social role of women was of decisive importance in the primitive period of a natural division of labor.

In the course of the subsequent development of agriculture, the domestication of animals, and improvement of methods of self-defense, the men began to play a decisive role in the labor collective, and it became the practice to trace kinship through the paternal line. The further development of production and blood and family relations by means of limiting promiscuous sexual relations was effected with the rise of monogamy, the family, private ownership of certain means of production, and the institution of inheritance. In this period, female captives were not killed, but were kept in the family. However, the mixing of blood in this way did not alter the fact that the clan consisted of persons related through the paternal line. Apparently, the division of relatives into distant and close already existed at this time. It is significant that among many peoples the concept of "close relatives" does not extend beyond second cousins and the members of their families. Beyond this boundary come "distant" relatives.

In my view, "distant" should be understood in the literal sense; i.e., in the sense of "living far from" the basic clan. Actually, at an early stage a large number of persons could not live together, work together, and eat together. Hence superfluous members (presumably the children of second cousins) were apparently compelled to create a new group of hunters and fishermen, to separate from the basic clan, and thus to lay the foundations of a new clan and forget their ancient ancestors. According to the data of modern archeology the size of a primitive clan varied from 30 to 50 persons. (In this connection it should be added that in the Turkish languages the word meaning "fifty" (ellig, eliv, elli) coincides with the word "ellik," meaning "to live in the world," "to communicate," "society." Also, the historically known il or khans (literally translated) of the Golden Horde actually means the khans of ili

(eli); i.e., khans of societies.)

The merger of two clans, equally weak or strong but linguistically related and territorially close to each other, might lead to the formation of a tribal language with dialects. Thus F. Engels writes: "Actually, the tribe and the dialect coincide: the formation of new tribes and dialects by means of division has taken place in America quite recently... In cases where two weakened tribes merge into one, it sometimes happens that by way of exception the same tribes will speak two closely related dialects." (F. Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," p 93.) The language of the old clan is more primitive and monotonous than the language of the tribe.

In present-day literature there is no clear delineation between the concepts of clan and tribe as historical types of human community. Thus in scientific reference books, dictionaries, and textbooks one encounters the following definitions of the clan and the tribe: "A clan is the basic cell of the primitive social system. The members of the clan are joined together by blood and family ties, by clan ownership of the means of production, by collective production and consumption, and by clan customs and religious beliefs. In the history of the development of the clan system, two consecutive stages succeeded each other: the matriarchy and the patriarchy..." ("The Encyclopedic Dictionary," Vol III, M, 1955, p 112.)

"A tribe is a community of human beings characteristic of the primitive social system which arises on the basis of common descent from one ancestor (actually or mythically) and also on the basis of common territory and culture...collective property, a specific social organization (tribal chief, tribal council, etc.), tribal customs, mythology, and religious beliefs are typical of the tribe." (Ibid, Vol II, p 667.)

These two definitions beg the question of the relationship of the category of the clan and that of the tribe. It seems to me that although the question of the relationship of these two categories is not posed in the historical, anthropological and ethnographic literature, in practice "tribe" is usually taken to mean a more complex organization than the clan -- one typical of the last stage of the

primitive social system. For example, a primitive tribe clan would scarcely choose a chief, when the patriarch of a large family was himself a chief.

Apparently, the necessity for choosing a chief and a tribal council arises in the period of the merger of several clans having common ownership of land but living apart from one another, each with its own patriarch. By this time the matriarchy was apparently a thing of the past, except for residual phenomena.

In his work, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," F. Engels considers the tribe as a totality of several clans, and a league of tribes as a merger of tribes based on the principle of common ancestors which took place in the last period of the primitive mode of production. Concerning one such league, Engles writes: "A permanent league of five related tribes on the basis of full equality and independence in all internal affairs of the tribe...Of the five tribes, three were called paternal, and were as brothers to one another; two were called filial tribes, and were likewise as brothers to each other...The common language, which had only differences of dialect, was the manifestation and proof of a common descent." (F. Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," pp. 96-97.)

In this period, in addition to the clan property, there were common winter and summer pasturages, hunting grounds, and neutral zones dividing the common property of the tribe from the territory of other tribes.

Concerning these neutral zones Engels writes: "In addition to the area where it actually lived, each tribe owned a considerable region for hunting and fishing. Beyond its boundaries was an extensive neutral zone extending as far as the property of the neighboring tribe, or even further, in the case of tribes not linguistically related. This zone was the same thing as the boundary forests of the Germanic peoples...between the Germanic peoples and the Slavs was the Saxon Forest and branibog (in Slavonic, 'protective forest'), from which Brandenburg derived its name." (Ibid, p 93.)

We have already mentioned cases where land was held in common by representatives of different clans not related

by common ancestry and living as individual families on one territory -- the so-called "territorial leagues." In addition to common property, these families had their own private property (house, livestock, and tools). The family consisted of the following persons: the great-grandfather and great grandmother, the grandfather and grandmother, the father and mother, and their children. After the death of the old men (the grandfather or father, the brothers either continued to live together, or they separated. Later on the head of the family would set up separate domiciles for his married sons, giving them a portion of the land, the livestock, and the tools. In such cases it was the practice to buy and sell houses, although the territory set apart for the new farm was sometimes held in common. It was also the practice to rent plots of ground for the season.

Similar vestiges of the primitive mode of production existed even after the division of the society into classes; i.e., after the rise of nationalities and even nations. However, these vestiges do not fully characterize the primitive social system and the system of blood relations, and they do not always coincide with what existed in the remote past. In view of this fact, we must now distinguish among the concepts of "clan system," "primitive social system," "clan," and "lineage." Thus in the period of the breakup of the primitive mode of production and the rise of classes, the ruling classes considered their clan ancient and noble. Free peasants considered themselves noble. Dependent peasants who had been sold into serfdom by their impoverished parents knew nothing of their relatives from their earliest years; or if they did know, they hated them for having sold them into bondage. Historical literature tells of the tragic consequences of meetings between a son who had been sold and the father who sold him. It is not to be wondered that the poorest families sold their children in foreign countries.

Thus in the period of slave-holding and feudalism, what remains of the clan community is community of noble ancestors (geneological), community of language, and certain elements of customs and culture.

The collective ownership of means of production gives way to private property.

In the process of the rise of private property within

the tribe (association of related clans) or league of tribes, there occurs the development of territorial leagues consisting of peasants not related by common ancestors; or, in other words, the formation of nationalities and peoples begins.

The old proverbs, "Kin, or not kin, we feed our own people," etc., apparently belong to this period.

From the foregoing we may draw the following general conclusions.

The clan community was formed at an early stage in the development of the primitive mode of production, which was characterized by: joint fashioning and use of production tools and, consequently, collective ownership of the means of production; communal habitation, community of ancestors (matriarchy or patriarchy), community of primitive language (without dialects), customs, and material and spiritual culture.

The tribal community was formed of different but linguistically related and territorially adjacent clans in the last period of the primitive mode of production, when hunting had begun to yield to animal husbandry and agriculture, marriages between parents and children and brothers and sisters were prohibited, and fraternal leagues were formed with representatives of other clans. The language of the tribe was divided into dialects, and was more developed than the language of the early (isolated) clan.

The tribal community is less stable than the clan community: tribes formed and broke up, while the basic clan (persons living together and having common ancestors) remained as the permanent cell of primitive society.

Such are the typical features of the clan-tribal community in general.

However, this historical type of human community, like other types, arose in various forms in accordance with the particular conditions. For example, the history of the clan-tribal relations of the nomadic peoples differs somewhat from that of settled peoples.

Furthermore, there were certain slight peculiarities within the society of the settled peoples and the nomadic peoples, although their essence was the same: clan-tribal community. F. Engels noted that "just as several clans will

later form a phratry, so several phratries, in the class form of the clan system will form a tribe; while in some cases rather seriously weakened tribes will lack the middle link -- the phratry." (F. Engels, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," p 93.)

The Category of the Nationality and a Brief History of its Study

We noted above that the largest number of inaccuracies and controversial questions are to be found in articles and monographs devoted to the category of the nationality and the history of individual peoples.

This is partially explained by the fact that in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin in which there is a detailed consideration of the conditions of development of clan-tribal and national relations, there is no special consideration of the category of the nationality; i.e., these works do not show its difference from the tribe and the nation, although all of the necessary elements for such a description are given. This fact, plus a number of others, have provided some grounds for thinking that Marx and Engels did not consider the "nationality" as an historically defined form of human community; that they divided peoples into "modern" and "ancient" nations. The problem is further complicated because in the scientific literature no regard is paid to the fact that the "territorial league" of the era of feudalism, which Lenin wrote about in his work, "What Are the 'Friends of the People' and How Do They Combat the Social Democrats?" corresponds to the modern meaning of the term "nationality."

The term "nationality" is likewise not to be found in I. V. Stalin's work, "Marxism and the National Question." His statement: "...the great empires of Cyrus or Alexander could not be called nations, although they had been formed historically -- formed out of various tribes and races. They were not nations, but haphazard and loosely related conglomerates of groups, dissolving or merging in accordance with the successes or defeats of a given conqueror," (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol 2, p 293.) has been applied not only to the ancient states but to the ancient Greeks and Persians

serving as the nucleus of those empires which had created large cities, trading centers, literature, philosophy, art (theatre, sculpture, etc.) and the foundations of modern science, and they have been called haphazard and loosely related conglomerates of tribes.

That the great empires of Cyrus and Alexander were not single nations is incontrovertible, although it is inaccurate to say they were formed "out of various tribes," since almost all of the peoples making up those empires were divided into classes and were not tribes, regardless of the presence of tribal vestiges. The division of the Greeks into classes of a slave-holding society 200 years before the formation of "the Great Empire of Alexander" is well known. Thus there remains an unanswered question: What were the Persians and Greeks who constituted a part of these empires as supporters of the conquerors, if they are not to be classified as nations and tribes? Moreover, this same work of I. V. Stalin contains a statement to the effect that the British, Germans, and other peoples were formed into nations "of peoples of various races and tribes" (I. V. Stalin, "Works," p 93), which does not fully correspond to his basic thesis, given in the same work: "A nation is not simply an historical category, but an historical category of a particular era -- the era of rising capitalism...The British, French, Germans, Italians, and others were formed into nations under the victorious leadership of capitalism triumphing over feudal disorganization" (Ibid, p 303 and gives the false impression that nations arise directly in the period of the dissolution of the primitive social system and the blood and family relations of that time.

Strictly speaking, however, all of the bourgeois nations mentioned in I. V. Stalin's work were formed from representatives of various nationalities, and not tribes. More precisely: those nationalities which became nations included representatives of other nationalities, and in certain cases, individual representatives of tribes.

In my view, the inconsistency of these two theses in I. V. Stalin's work may be explained by the fact that at that time the problem of the nationality had not only not been solved, but not even posed. The immediate problems were those of the relation of Marxism to nations and the

national-liberation movement, the struggle against chauvinism, combining the national and international problems of the proletariat, etc. It was especially important to buttress the Marxist-Leninist principle that prior to the rise of capitalism there were no nations in the strict sense of the word. Hence the question of the prehistoric nation, the category of the nationality, was not taken up in "Marxism and the National Question." This fact has given rise to numerous vague and controversial questions in the scientific literature and propaganda practice: questions as to the so-called "ancient" and "modern" nations, the time of the rise of nations in general, of language and other characteristics of nations existing prior to the era of capitalism, etc.

In his work, "Leninism and the National Question," I. V. Stalin, in answer to those comrades who had asked him to explain several questions, stated that "...there could not have been any nations in the precapitalist period, since there were no national markets; there were neither national economic nor national cultural centers..." I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol II, p 336.). Stalin called the bourgeois nations "so-called 'modern' nations"; and he did not throw any light upon the question as to the sense in which the founders of marxism used the expression "ancient nations," or how legitimate it was in the 19th Century, when the very term "nation," meaning "people," did not have the strict sense which it acquired in the time of V. I. Lenin, or why this expression is now obsolete. However, the passage cited by I. V. Stalin (Ibid, p 337.) from V. I. Lenin's work, "What Are the 'Friends of the People' and How Do They Combat the Social Democrats?" helps us to understand that the bourgeois nations were preceded by the formation of territorial leagues from which (but not from tribes) the bourgeois nations began to be formed during the period of the rise of capitalism. Subsequently, Stalin noted that "elements of nations (bourgeois -- A.S.) "language, territory, cultural community, etc.," were created "little by little as early as the pre-capitalist period..." (Ibid, p 336.), but there were still no nations, since there were no national economic and cultural centers like those around which the people later were formed into a single national whole.

However, I. V. Stalin did not explain in his work the stage at which the quantitative changes in these elements lead to the rise of a qualitatively new (national) society. Nor did he elucidate the question as to what names to give to the creators and bearers of the elements of nations which had existed for hundred of years in the period of the formation of the precapitalist classes.

It was not until 1950, in his work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," that I. V. Stalin considered the language of a nationality. He wrote: "The single language of a nationality which has not yet become a nation..." (I. V. Stalin, "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," M, Gospolitizdat, 1953, p 44.) The year 1947 saw the publication in "Vestnik Leningradskogo Universiteta" [Herald of Leningrad University] of an article by L. P. Yakubinskiy, "The Formation of Nationalities and their Languages" (L. P. Yakubinskiy, "The Formation of Nationalities and their Languages," Vestnik LGU, 1947, No. 1) which, unfortunately, was known only to the Leningrad linguists. In that article L. P. Yakubinskiy wrote that a nationality is a production of the era of the "rising" class society, meaning slaveholding feudalism. (L. P. Yakubinskiy, Op. cit., p 144). However, L. P. Yakubinskiy did not discuss the typical features of a nationality, except for his description of the peculiarities of the language of a nationality.

Another service for which Yakubinskiy should be given credit was the fact that in studying the works of Marx and Engels, he came to the conclusion "at the time of Marx and Engels the word 'nation' (nation) was not yet being used in the strict terminological sense which it was accorded in the works of V. I. Lenin..." (L. P. Yakubinskiy, Op. cit., pp 153-153.)

Actually, in the time of Marx and Engels the words "people," "nationality," and "nation" had not yet been differentiated in the European languages. Therefore, the founders of Marxism could use the expressions "modern nations" and "ancient nations" in the sense of "modern peoples" and "ancient peoples," since the Latin word "nation" meant "people." But in the era of imperialism there occurred a sharp division of peoples into large bourgeois nations and into those which had not yet reached the era of capitalism.

and hence had not yet developed from a nationality into a bourgeois nation. Hence by the time of V. I. Lenin the term "ancient nations" had become obsolete and hampered the struggle against those which all peoples known to history had called nations. Because of this, the expression "modern nations" also became obsolete, since those nations which were not modern (the "ancient" nations) could not be classified as nations in the sense of that word current in the time of V. I. Lenin. Moreover, those nations known to Marx and Engels have in our time been divided into bourgeois and socialist nations. However, the bourgeois and socialist nations, despite the qualitative difference between them, have something in common which distinguishes them from the ancient "nations" (nationalities) and makes them nations in the strict and modern sense of that word. Thus the term "ancient nations" has plainly become obsolete and should be replaced by the more modern term "nationality."

Before the Latin word "nation" (nation) was borrowed from the French language, the term "nationality" was being used in the Russian language in the sense of "the totality of the properties and way of life distinguishing one people from another." (V. Dal', "Explanatory Dictionary," Vol II, 2nd Edition, St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1881, p 462.)

In our literature after 1950 it became the practice to apply to a nationality those "elements of a nation" listed by I. V. Stalin in his work, "The National Question and Leninism." However, the lack of a community of economic life among these elements enumerated was interpreted as a denial by I. V. Stalin of the presence of an economic community among the persons constituting a nationality, although in I. V. Stalin's work it was a question of the lack of national markets, which does not exclude the presence of unstable local markets. Moreover, in addition to the elements enumerated (territory, language, culture), the conventional "etc." may merely have hidden the fourth element: a community of economy. And his earlier statement that the Georgians of pre-Reform times lived on a common territory and spoke one language, yet did not constitute a single nation, since they were scattered among numerous separate principalities and could not lead a common economic life (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol 2, p 295) was interpreted by some

persons as a denial of the presence of economic and market relations, not only among individual principalities but also within one principality. However, within principalities there were unstable local markets. Here I. V. Stalin had in mind those cases where some particular feudal lord had succeeded in temporarily seizing and administering large regions which were not interconnected by an economically single and stable system of small and large markets.

There was good reason for V. I. Stalin to note that "actually, the factual merger" of scattered "regions, lands, and principalities into a single whole...was due to the increased intercourse between regions, the gradually growing commerce, and the concentration of small local markets into one all-Russian market." (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol 1, p 137.) It was precisely these small local markets which to some extent unified the population of the nationality out of which the nation was subsequently formed.

In light of these facts one can scarcely regard as accurate the following statement made in our philosophical literature: "As is generally known, under capitalism a nationality was distinguished from a nation by the absence in the former of the important trait of a community of economic life, since the economy of the nationality was still dominated by precapitalistic (feudal, patriarchal-clannish) relations..." ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," p 63.) The presence of precapitalist relations in the economy of the nationality, even "in the period of capitalism," but not before its rise, should not be considered as a complete lack of any community of economic life, including commodity-monetary relations. On the other hand, the rise of classes and the formation of nationalities should not be considered as the definitive elimination of vestiges of the primitive mode of production and of blood and family ties, as was said above.

Thus nationalities develop in the period of the breakdown of the primitive mode of production and of clan-tribal relations and the rise of the slave-holding or feudal society, by means of the merger of representatives of different tribes with some tribe, within and on whose territory it has become possible to exploit prisoners and then kinsmen, and where there has developed a small local market (the selling of grain

and fruits to those raising livestock; of meat, hides, and wool to those engaged in agriculture; and the selling of tools, production implements, and household articles).

However, in the slave-holding or feudal formation the conditions did not obtain for the development of a close-knit and stable community of economy on a large scale. This was due to the low labor productivity, the quasi-natural character of the economy, and its negligible ratio of commodity production to total output. In this period, therefore, the community of language, culture, and territory on which the nationalities lived was also negligible and unstable.

Thus dialects and differences in usage existed not only in the speech of the environing villages but even in the speech of the inhabitants of the prince's capital. For example, the handicraftsmen and peasants who formerly had spoken an unrelated language, learned the peculiarities of the local speech in their own way (they distorted the pronunciation of the sounds of the local language, etc.) and very slowly, since the language of the local market was not greatly superior to their own in its development.

However, in the formation of the nationality there were periods which correspond to the periods in the development of the production relations of a feudal or slave-holding society. Thus in the period of the predominance of land rent paid "in kind," the community of language and other traits of a nationality was more pronounced than in the period of the predominance of the corvee; and in the period of monetary rent this community assumes even greater proportions.

Even in the last period of the development of feudal relations, however, new military-trade communications and trading centers may arise. Thus it is not a matter of accident that prior to the formation of the multinational Russian state and the development of one of the local markets into a stable market serving large regions, armed conflicts and destruction radically changed the life of the nationalities of Russia: sizeable market centers disappeared and others arose. For example, after the fall of the Astrakhan' Khanate in the middle of the 16th Century the administrative, commercial, and cultural importance of the city of Astrakhan' grew considerably. On the banks of the Terek

River there arose such strong trading centers as Kizlyar and others connecting the Caucasus with Astrakhan'. This reduced to a negligible quantity the role of the local trading centers -- Endrey, Targu, and others -- located at the junctions of the roads connecting the mountain and steppe (summer and winter) grazing lands; while Ullu Mazhar and Gichchi Mazhar, mentioned in "Derbent Name" and shown on a Russian map at the beginning of the 17 Century in "The Great Map," disappeared without a trace. The Nogaytsy were scattered into two territorially separate groups. In the 19th Century, in connection with the construction of the railroad linking Rostov and Baku, there arose industrial and trading centers much larger than Kizlyar and Astrakhan' (e.g., Grozny and others).

In more remote times the position of the nationalities was even more unstable -- especially in the period of the Mongol khans.

The foregoing provides grounds for assuming that a nationality is an unstable community of language, culture, territory, and local economy.

The nationality precedes the nation. I. V. Stalin defines a nation as a stable community of basic elements: language, culture, territory, and economy.

In this connection the reason for the stability is assumed to be obvious. They the elements are made stable by the development of economic regions with industrial and trading centers. In the absence of an industrial center an unstable community of language and the other traits of a nationality cannot become a stable community of language and other aspects characteristic of a nation. It is not without reason that history tells of the perishing or merger of individual nationalities while there are no known instances of the disappearance of a nation founded on a stable community of economy. (For example, the Guyens and the nationalities inhabiting the Tyumin' state mentioned in the literary sources of the 16th and 17th centuries, merged with the Kumyks and other neighboring nationalities.)

In this connection, the following definition of a nationality, found in the textbook, "Historical Materialism," must be considered inaccurate: "A nationality...is an association of tribes related linguistically and in terms of

their origin, and have a common territory." ("Historical Materialism," 2nd Edition, M, Gospolitizdat, 1954, p 274.) It is inaccurate because temporary leagues of tribes also possessed common pasturages and hunting grounds, but did not constitute a nationality. A nationality is characterized by the exploitation of prisoners, the admission of representatives of tribes not having ancestors in common, and the formation of small local markets for the sale of tools, production implements, pottery, decorative articles, and slaves.

In "Historical Materialism" it is further stated: "With the rise of private property and classes the primitive social system disappears. persons of various clans and tribes...intermingle increasingly and are scattered over a single territory: so-called territorial tribes come into being. The tribes lose their insularity and independence, and government passes into the hands of the state -- the organization of the ruling class." (Ibid, pp 274-275.)

The fallaciousness of this statement is evident. The rise of classes is accompanied by the rise, not of "territorial tribes" but of "territorial leagues"; and the state as the "organization of the ruling class" arises not in order to govern the tribes (which, moreover, no longer exist, having been divided into classes and intermingled) but in order to keep a firm hand on the oppressed portion of the "territorial league" (nationality).

Thus a nationality arises in the period of dissolution of clan-tribal relations and the rise of the classes of pre-capitalist formations.

A nationality is an unstable community of language, culture, territory, and economy. The periods of development of nationalities correspond to the periods of development of slave-holding and feudal society.

The most developed period is the period of the predominance of commodity-monetary relations.

Not all nationalities have become bourgeois nations, and not all socialist nationalities have become socialist nations. This applies first of all to those which in the course of history have lost their own territory and economic ties, inhabit various territories, and gradually merge with other nationalities and nations.

Concerning the Relationship among the Categories "Nationality," "People," and "National Group"

In his article, "The Basic Stages in the Ethnic Development of the Russian People," Professor V. V. Mavrodin writes that Professor Kammar "for some reason opposes the concept of 'people' to the concept of 'nationality.'" (V. V. Mavrodin, "The Basic Stages in the Ethnic Development of the Russian People," "Voprosy Istorii" [Problems of History], 1950, No 4.) Obviously, Professor Mavrodin had in mind Kammar's statement that "the concept of 'nation' should be distinguished from the concepts of 'people' and 'nationality' as an ethnographic category..." and his affirmation that "peoples and nationalities" arose as a result of the breakdown of the primitive social system. ("Voprosy Istorii," 1949, No 12, p 68.)

V. V. Mavrodin therefore writes: "It is evident that during the era of the Kiev State its population was ethnically formed into a single Russian people..." and he especially emphasizes "or, which is the same thing, into a single Russian nationality." (Ibid, p 62.) In this case Professor Mavrodin is considering only the case of the coincidence of the concept of "people with the concepts of "nation," "nationality," and "national group," leaving aside the cases where they differ, since this problem is not the basic theme of his article.

On the other hand, in his article "A People as a Sociological Category," A. P. Butenko considers the category "people" (as he himself writes) merely as a socio-political category, leaving aside such instances of its use as "the Russian people," etc.

Thus, in our literature these categories are considered somewhat distortedly.

Without any claim to completeness, we may note that Professor Mavrodin is of course correct. One should not oppose the concept of "people" to that of "nationality." But at the same time one should not equate them completely. All the more so, since in the period of feudalism the word "people" was used primarily to designate the masses of people dependent upon the feudal lord, and not to designate linguistic and other distinguishing traits. (We shall not

dwell on the question as to the sense in which this word was used in ancient Greece and other countries.)

Moreover, the feudal lords did not consider themselves as belonging to the people -- not only because some of them were the representatives of conquerors from other countries, but also because they considered the people as their property. It is significant that the Georgians and other linguistically different peoples of the Caucasus and Central Asia use the Arabic word "khalk'" in the sense of "people," "mass," "population," to designate the concept "people." The leading role of the socio-political significance of this word is so great that even in those cases where it is used to designate contemporary nationalities and nations (e.g., the Italian people, the peoples of Asia, etc.) it refers primarily to the mass of common people; i.e., the basic meaning of the word. It is also significant that even V. Dal', in his "Explanatory Dictionary," defines "people" as "a folk which has come into being in a certain area... inhabitants of a country speaking one language...rabble, common people; low, poll-tax paying classes." (V. Dal', "Explanatory Dictionary," Vol II, p 461.) The formally linguistic word "na + rod" means that which has come into being above the clan, the mass. In the ancient Turkish languages the word "kamyk" -- mass, multiplicity, people -- means roughly the same thing. Thus in feudal times the word "people" was used to distinguish between the common people and the handful of feudal lords in a country. Somewhat later it apparently became the practice to use the word "nationality" to designate the common people of neighboring countries, also dependent upon their own feudal lords but differing from the others as to territory, language, and customs. It is not without reason that V. Dal', in his "Explanatory Dictionary," defines "nationality," in contradistinction to "people," as "...the totality of properties and way of life which distinguishes one people from another."

The class content of the concept "people" has not been lost in the period of capitalism. Thus even in those cases where the word "people" is used in lieu of the word "nationality" or "nation" ("the American people") it refers primarily to the common people. And this is understandable,

since they are the decisive force in social development. However much the scope of the concept "people" may change in the period of feudalism, capitalism, and the transition to socialism (the elimination of the antagonistic classes), the basic content of this concept will remain "the common people." This peculiarity of the concept "people" is not taken into account by A. P. Butenko, who overemphasizes the variability in the scope of this concept, desirous of noting the participation of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against feudalism. Thus he writes: "A people is an historically changing community of social groups with a different class structure at different stages of their history." ("Voprosy Filosofii" [Problems of Philosophy], 1957, No 1, p 182.) Moreover, this definition does not explain the "changing community" itself. (One may ask: A community of what aspects of the social groups (language, etc.)?)

Further on in his article, however, A. P. Butenko gives a second definition; "A people is an historically changing community of human beings including that portion, those strata, those classes of the population which by virtue of their objective position are capable of joint participation in solving the problems of the progressive, revolutionary movement of the given country at the given stage." (Ibid.) In this connection the author quotes V. I. Lenin's familiar remark that "in using the word 'people,' Marx did not conceal the class differences, but combined the particular elements capable of bringing the revolution to completion" (V. I. Lenin, "Works," Vol 9, p 112) without understanding that the elements "capable of bringing the revolution to completion" are not identical with (not equivalent to) those which are "capable of joint participation in solving the problems of the progressive, revolutionary development..." since not all of the participants are capable of bringing the revolution to completion. Thus in this definition A. P. Butenko, in an effort to include in the concept "people" all of the participants in the revolutionary movement, has lost sight of the fact that at all stages of social development the common people were the creators of history. In my view a people consists of the creators (the common people) of material and spiritual values and their political allies taking part in the struggle for democracy,

peace, and socialism. The addition, "of the given country, at the given stage," is superfluous.

While A. P. Butenko correctly notes that the concept "people" does not coincide "either with the concept 'population' or the concept 'nation,'" he does not substantiate this with appropriate arguments. It goes without saying that the concept "population" is broader in its content than the concept "nation," and that the concept "people" is narrower than that of "nation." For example, the concepts "the Japanese people," "the Japanese nation," and "the population of Japan" differ by virtue of the fact that the first envisages chiefly the common people, the second encompasses all strata having uniform national characteristics, and the concept "the population of Japan" covers the quantitative aspect of the people inhabiting Japan, also including representatives of other national groups living in that country.

It is significant that the latin word "nation," meaning "people," has apparently since the time of the French Revolution been used in the Russian language (as V. Dal' expresses it) "...in a broad sense..." as "...persons of the same race odnoporodtsy speaking a common language; all strata sosloviya"; but not the entire population, since the latter also includes representatives of other nations living in the country in question who are not envisaged here.

We must also take up the question of the relationship between the categories "nationality" and "national group."

Professor V. V. Mavrodin notes that the concept "national group" in the narrow sense corresponds to "nationality." ("Voprosy Istorii," 1950, No 4, p. 55.) However, it should be added that the concept "national group" also corresponds to the concept "nation." For example, the Council of Nationalities USSR includes representatives of all of the peoples (nations and nationalities) since all nations are at the same time national groups, but not all national groups may be called nations. Consequently, the name Council of Nationalities is considerably more comprehensive than the name "Council of Nations," and is determined by the existence in the USSR not only of nations but also of nationalities. (In this connection one must regard as incorrect the

the expression "nations and national groups" in lieu of "nations and nationalities," used in scientific articles, since the concept "national group" includes both of the other two concepts without distinguishing between them.)

The fact that the concept "national group" coincides with the qualitatively different concepts "nationality" and "nation" is due to the circumstance that "national group" encompasses numerous general traits of a nationality and a nation without regard to the degree of their development and stability.

The fact that numerous general traits of both a nationality and a nation are subsumed under the single concept of "national group" is not a matter of accident, since the foundations of the stable community of language and other aspects of a nation came into being in the period of the rise and formation of the nationality. In the era of industrial development and economic consolidation, these foundations developed into a stable community of all of the elements characterizing a nation.

In the process of the further building of a communist society the large nationalities will become nations, while the small ones will merge with related and neighboring nations. As a result, the category "national group" will mean belonging to some particular nation, but not to a nationality.

Bourgeois and Socialist Nations Socialist Nationalities and Socialist Nations

A nationality is formed from representatives of different tribes and races on the basis of the territory, language, and culture of a particular tribe within which a division into classes has taken place and a local market has come into being. Historically, the nationality precedes the nation. However, not all nationalities have become bourgeois nations. The bourgeois nations were formed from representatives of different nationalities, races and (partially) tribes on the basis of the territory, language, and culture of a particular nationality which set out on the path of capitalist development. (However, there are nations which were formed from representatives of different nations,

nationalities, tribes, and races. For example, some of the nations of America were formed of British, Spaniards, and others who had left their own countries subsequent to the rise of the British, Spanish, and other nations.)

The rise of capitalist industrial and trading enterprises, the intensification of monetary circulation, and the existence of communications, the press, the mails, the telegraph, and cultural institutions leads to the combination of previously scattered economic regions into a single whole.

In his criticism of Mikhaylovskiy, V. I. Lenin wrote: "This merger was due not to ties of kinship...and not even to their extension and generalization: it was due to the increased intercourse among regions, the gradually growing commerce, the concentration of small local markets into one all-Russian market." (V. I. Lenin, "Works," Vol 1, p 137.)

In the process of the formation of a stable and close-knit economic community of human beings it was necessary at the same time to assume a stable and national character and the other "elements of a nation" out of which the bourgeois nation was formed: territory, culture, and language. For example, one of the dialects of the basic nationality had to be developed and become the national literary language, which at the same time was enriched at the expense of the other dialects, which continued to exist along with the national language in view of the opposition between the urban and the rural areas in the era of capitalism. Thus a community of economic life was the governing trait of the nation.

A critique of the bourgeois theory of the nation, and a Marxist definition of the nation, were given by I. V. Stalin in his work, "Marxism and the National Question," which played an important role in substantiating and developing the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism on the national question. It is quite natural that this work, written before the rise of the socialist nations, does not contain the terms "socialist nations" and "bourgeois nations"; but it did provide a clear substantiation of the principle that there were no nations before capitalism, and it exposed the bourgeois character of nationalism. However, several of our philosophical works fail to pay heed, not only to

this, but also to the familiar statement of the "Communist Manifesto": "Since the proletariat must first of all win political power, raise itself to the position of a national class, and constitute itself as a nation, it is itself national for the time being, although not in the way the bourgeoisie understands the word." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," Vol 4, p 444.) Nor do they pay heed to the statement of V. I. Lenin: "Since the leaders and masters of this process were capitalist merchants, the creation of these national ties was nothing else than the creation of bourgeois ties." (V. I. Lenin, "Works," Vol 1, pp 137-138.)

Despite these statements and the tremendous changes which have taken place in the process of the elimination of the exploiter classes, many scholars did not see the basic difference between nations prior to the publication of I. V. Stalin's work, "The National Question and Leninism."

This error was also due to the fact that the elimination of the bourgeois nations was regarded as the elimination of nations in general. "These new nations," I. V. Stalin wrote, "arose and developed on the basis of the old bourgeois nations as a result of the elimination of capitalism -- by means of their radical transformation in the spirit of socialism." (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol II, p 339.)

Whereas the rise and development of the bourgeois nations was accompanied by the rise of two antagonistic classes (the proletariat and the bourgeoisie) and the organization of predatory wars, the socialist nations arose in the process of the elimination of the exploiter classes -- in the process of the building of socialism. As early as 1929, I. V. Stalin wrote: "The working class and its international Party constitute that force which strengthens these new nations and guides them. The union of the working class and the laboring peasantry within a nation for the elimination of vestiges of capitalism in the name of the triumphant building of socialism; the annihilation of vestiges of the national yoke in the name of the equality and free development of nations and national minorities; the annihilation of vestiges of nationalism in the name of establishing friendship among peoples and the affirmation of internationalism...such is the spiritual and socio-political profile of these nations." (I. V. Stalin, "Works," Vol II, p 339.)

In the process of the elimination of the exploiter classes and the building of socialism there was also a change in the moral and political profile of those nationalities which had not yet become bourgeois nations.

All of the nationalities of old Russia, without exception, were subjected to economic, political, and national oppression. The liberation of those peoples took place thanks to the all-out assistance of the Russian proletariat, and was accompanied by the further strengthening of friendship between the formerly oppressed nationalities and the Russian and other nations. In the process of the building of socialism the old nationalities became socialist nationalities, and some of them were transformed -- or are being transformed -- into socialist nations.

However, in the philosophical literature there is no satisfactory solution of the problem of the relationship of a socialist nation to a socialist nationality. For example, Comrade Tsameryan, one of the authors of the work, "The Socialist Nations of the USSR," in answering the question as to what distinguishes the socialist nations from nationalities in the USSR, wrote that "...the difference consists merely in the degree of development of these characteristics common to nations and nationalities. The common economic basis for the development of both nationalities and nations in the USSR is socialized ownership of the means of production. Nations differ from nationalities by virtue of the degree of development of industry in the former, the size of the working class and the cadres of intelligentsia, and the development and richness of culture..." ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," p 65.)

One serious shortcoming of this definition, it seems to me, is that it glosses over the qualitative difference between the concepts "socialist nations" and "socialist nationalities," considering that they differ "only in the degree of development" of the traits enumerated by the author. For it is a well known fact that the socialist nations, too, differ among themselves as regards the degree of development of these characteristics. For example, there are old and new nations, large and small nations. It may be asked: What, then, is the difference between small nations and nationalities? And at what "stage" of development of

the "characteristics common to nations and nationalities" can a nationality qualitatively change and become a nation? And how does one classify those peoples of the USSR on whose territory there is no industry or local working class; i.e., the most important of the "characteristics common to nations and nationalities"?

According to this definition, those peoples who do not have their own industry and workers, remain outside the category of a nationality and that of a nation. And we might add that they cannot be classified as clans or tribes. If only those peoples possessing their own industry and the other characteristics "common to nations and nationalities" can be counted as nations or nationalities, in accordance with the degree of development of these common traits, then logical consistency required that the author show at what "state of development" of industry, the working class, and the other "characteristics common to nations and nationalities," a socialist nationality can qualitatively change and become a nation.

The author did not do this, and he could not have done it, because the statement in question is fundamentally erroneous. One may state directly and categorically state that any people possessing an industry, a working class, and the other characteristics enumerated by the author, can be considered a nation. In the history of the formation of the bourgeois and socialist nations there was not a single case where a people possessing, on its own territory, an industry and an indigenous working class, remained a nationality. By way of anticipation, let us say that a socialist nationality differs from a socialist nation not by virtue of the "degree of development of those characteristics common to nations and nationalities," but by the lack of one criterion typical only of a socialist nation and, consequently, by the degree of development of the other "characteristics common to nations and nationalities"; viz., by the lack of industry.

It is because of this mistaken idea of the relationship between nations and nationalities that I. P. Tsameryan, without advancing any arguments, considers any process of the consolidation of nationalities as a process of the formation of a nation, not suspecting that not every consolidation

can lead to the formation of a nation.

Moreover, the author contradicts his own definition when he includes among the young nations the Avartsy and other small peoples who are in process of consolidation with them, including the Botlikhtsy and the Andiytsy -- peoples on whose territory there is no industry or working class. (The collection, "The Socialist Nations of the USSR," pp 62-63.) Because the definition in question states that the presence of industry and a working class is typical not only of nations but also of socialist nationalities, differing "merely in the degree" of their development.

In my view the presence of industry and a working class is typical only of a nation and not of a nationality. And the stable economic consolidation of a nationality or nationalities into a nation begins not with the organization of rayon hospitals, secondary schools, and other institutions (although they are also very important), but with the development of an industrial center in which the local workers constitute the majority of the working class.

What, then, is represented by the consolidation of the small nationalities of Western Dagestan "into a single socialist nation with the Avartsy" about which I. P. Tsameryan writes without any appropriate grounds or references to literary sources) ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," pp 62-63.)

Let us see what has been written about this consolidation by students of the Avartsy and local workers familiar with the factual side of the question.

Actually, as a result of collectivization, the building of roads, economic and cultural development, and improvement of communications among individual regions, there has been an increased rapprochement among the dialects of the Avarian language itself. A literary language has been created "based on the so-called 'bolmats,' the 'wax' or 'social' language in use for a long time in social intercourse among individual communities of Avartsy." ("The Peoples of Dagestan," A Selection of Articles, 1955, p 61.)

In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the Avarian literary language, like all the other languages of the nationalities of Dagestan, is so lacking in development and refinement, that instruction in secondary

schools and higher educational institutions is given in Russian and not in Avarian. The following nationalities, related but differing linguistically, are now using the Avarian language somewhat more extensively than in the old days, as an international language (in dealings with the Avartsy and among themselves): the Andiytsy, the Akhvakhtsy, the Bagulaly, the Botlikhtsy, the Godoberintsy, the Karatin-tsy, the Tindaly, the Chamalaly (a subgroup of the Andiytsy), the Bezhtintsy, the Didoytsy, the Khvarshintsy, the Guizeb-tsy (a subgroup of the Didoytsy). In the elementary schools of these nationalities, instruction is given in the Avarian literary language; in the secondary schools, and all other schools of Dagestan, it is given in Russian. However, they retain their native speech, which despite its closeness to the Avarian language cannot be called a dialect of either the Northern, Southern, or literary language of the Avartsy.

It should also be remembered that the territory occupied by these small peoples (the size of the population of each nationality varies from 1,000 to 8,000 persons, and the total figure is about 50,000. The Avartsy living in Dagestan number about 200,000, and there are about 40,000 living outside Dagestan.) is located somewhat apart from the main mass of the Avartsy and, as Z. A. Nikol'skaya writes, "it has a certain geographic unity, and is divided into an interal zone, a mountainous zone, and an Alpine zone. It is this which has determined its economic profile." ("The Peoples of Dagestan," A Selection of Articles, p 61.) We might add that this circumstance should bring these small peoples closer together, and should tend to hinder their rapprochement with the Avartsy and make for the retention of the distinguishing features of their languages. It is not without reason that A. D. Daniyalov, in his Introduction to the selection of articles, "The Peoples of Dagestan," calls the Avartsy a nationality, and does not draw a conclusion as to the formation of an Avarian nation from the fact of their consolidation with other peoples. He writes: "Of the nationalities speaking Caucasian languages, the four largest are the Avartsy, the Dargintsy, the Lezgintsy, and the Laktsy...Today, in the Soviet Era, small ethnic groups which have preserved certain linguistic differences to the present, but which are near to the former in language,

culture, and way of life, are being consolidated around these peoples." (Ibid, p 6.)

The important thing for our purposes is that these "ethnic groups" have preserved their linguistic differences despite their consolidation with the Avartsy. Z. A. Nikol'skaya, a student of the Avartsy, says in her article, "The Avartsy": "...all of these groups, together with the Avartsy, have since olden days constituted a definite ethnic unity possessing a community of culture. But," she adds, "they differ linguistically." ("The Peoples of Dagestan," p 60.)

Moreover, as Z. A. Nikol'skaya notes, the Avarian language itself "includes a large number of dialects which could be combined into a North Avarian and a South Avarian language." (Ibid, p 48.) Also, none of these groups of dialects has yet come to dominate the others.

As is evident, the consolidation, not only of the small peoples of Western Dagestan with the Avartsy, but even between the Northern and Southern Avartsy, is still weak and unstable, and is therefore inadequate as the groundwork for the formation of a nation, although it is preparing such groundwork.

The process of consolidation mentioned above can assume a stable character and result in the formation of a nation only with the creation of an industrial center and the formation of a local working class on the territory of Avariya. On the other hand, this consolidation may assume a different character in the event of the rise of an industrial center on the territory of these small peoples or their Western neighbors (who are not Avartsy). This is a very real possibility, since the mineral deposits of the mountainous regions have not yet been thoroughly investigated. The further development of the socialist mining industry -- which, unlike the capitalist mining industry, does not have any national borders -- can lead to substantial changes in the consolidation of the small peoples of Western Dagestan with the Avartsy.

Thus in the absence of an industrial base there can be no close and stable community of language and the other aspects typical of a nation. In my view, the groundwork for the rise of an industrial center and a working class also

means the groundwork for the conversion of a nationality into a nation.

However, not every nationality on whose territory an industrial center develops can provide it with a sufficient labor force so that the number of local workers preponderates over the other workers; and in the absence of such a preponderance the local workers, and then the neighboring kolkhozes, will gradually learn the language predominating in the given industrial center, intermarry, and do other things leading to rapprochement and merger.

Consequently, in the absence of a definite minimum of population there is no possibility for a socialist nationality to become a nation during the period of the building of socialism and communism.

But our literature usually gives a positive answer to the question of the possibility for any socialist nationality of becoming a nation, regardless of the size of the population. An exception is allowed only in the aforementioned work; but that, for some reason, is allowed for nationalities with a population of less than 1,000 (!). For example, it is stated therein that "We have nationalities numbering less than 1,000 persons. In the process of economic and cultural intercourse with other nations they are acquiring their language and culture and without any compulsion are gradually merging with them..." ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," p 61.)

The question naturally arises: Why do nationalities with a population of less than 1,000 merge, while the others do not? What is the fate of those nationalities whose population is less than 2,000 or 3,000, or even 10,000 or 12,000?

It is difficult to say whether Comrade Tsameryan admits the possibility of becoming a nation in the case of nationalities with a population of more than 1,000; but grounds for such an interpretation are provided by his purely quantitative criterion which is not substantiated by proper arguments.

In my view, one may fine a more objective criterion for establishing the minimum of population required for the transformation of a nationality into a nation. For example, not only nationalities with a population of "less than 1,000,"

but also nationalities with a population of 20,000 or 30,000 (roughly, a national okrug) lack the possibility of becoming a nation, owing to the inadequacy of this population for purposes of creating an industry with a preponderance of local workers, to the lack of the economic possibility of having their own university for training highly skilled personnel, and to other factors without which there can be no nation.

It is not a matter of accident that in multilingual Dagestan a general university, medical institute, and other institutes, where all courses are taught in Russian, have been established for the Avartsy, the Kumyki, and other peoples. In Dagestan, as in other republics of the USSR, Russian has become an international language and is gradually penetrating into the way of life of each nationality.

Translations, made by the best translators, into the languages of these small nationalities are difficult to understand because of the underdevelopment of these languages. School attendance, service in the Soviet Army, social intercourse, and other factors are very rapidly facilitating the learning of the Russian language. In some areas Russian is used as a second mother tongue. A Russian original is frequently easier to understand than a translation. This is due to the fact that the acquisition of the language of the brotherly Russian people proceeds more rapidly than the development of the local languages. It commonly happens that certain workers do not take this factor into account. And yet V. I. Lenin predicted that "the absence of compulsion would intensify the non-Russian population's attraction to, and love for, the great Russian language." (V. I. Lenin, "Works," Vol. 20, pp 55-56.)

Thus the transformation of a nationality into a nation requires a minimum of population requisite for the creation of industry, the formation of a working class, and the training of personnel with advanced and medium skills. This minimum of population is considerably greater, not merely than 1,000, but also than 20,000 or 30,000. (The quantitative definition of such concepts as clan and tribe, nationality, and bourgeois and socialist nations has its own minimum and maximum. For example the primitive mode of production cannot group together a large mass of people.

Because of this, the excess part of the population must necessarily split off from their own clan.)

In the Soviet Union there are nationalities with a population inadequate for the formation of a working class and the creation of industrial and cultural centers on their territories. These peoples, gradually and without compulsion, are merging with other nationalities and nations. They include the Taty of the Transcaucasus, the Jewish mountaineers of the Northeastern Caucasus, the Nogaytsy, the Lokaytsy, and others. However, there are also socialist nationalities which have the possibility, in the course of communist building, of becoming socialist nations; e.g., the Avartsy, numbering about 250,000, and others. However, the formation of the socialist nations also means their rapprochement. Obviously, those socialist nations which are young and small will merge sooner with neighboring nations which are linguistically and culturally related to them, than will the older and bigger socialist nations.

On the basis of the foregoing we may affirm that a nation differs from a nationality not by virtue of the degree of development of industry, etc., but by the presence of an industrial center or centers on its territory, of a working class and, consequently, of a closer and more stable community of language and culture. Conversely, a nationality is distinguished from a nation by the lack of an industrial center, a local working class, and by the correspondingly weak and unstable community of language and other elements. Among themselves, socialist nations differ only by virtue of "the degree of industrial development, the size of the working class, and the cadres of the intelligentsia, and the wealth of culture..." ("The Socialist Nations of the USSR," p 64.)

Continuing with the definition we are considering, I. P. Tsameryan writes that "in the sphere of language the difference consists in the fact that in addition to their common language, nationalities preserve considerable differences in dialects which have not been dissolved in the common national language." (Ibid, p 63.)

However, despite the existence of linguistic differences, not only in the languages of the small nationalities of Western Dagestan but also in the Avarian language itself,

and despite his own correct thesis, the author declared that the consolidation of the small nationalities of Western Dagestan with the Avartsy was the groundwork for their merger "into a single socialist nation with the Avartsy."

A portion of the author's statement that dialects are "dissolved" in the language of an embryonic socialist nation contradicts the facts, not only in rural areas but even in such cities as Moscow and Leningrad, where one often encounters traces of dialects, especially among part of the adult population. Apparently, the process of the dissolution of dialects will continue until the elimination of the existing difference between the city and the country.

In my view, the difference between the language of a socialist nation and that of a nationality consists not in the absence of dialects, but in the obligatory preponderance of the common national language over the dialects. As a rule, such a preponderance is not typical of the language of a nationality, although exceptions may exist.

For example, in the language of the Georgian socialist nation, dialects (Western and Eastern) are more noticeable than in the language of such a small nationality as the Jewish mountaineers. But despite this fact, the Jewish mountaineers do not constitute a nation, owing to the lack of the other criteria typical of a nation. The Jewish mountaineers live in small groups in various mountains of the Northeastern Caucasus in which the great majority of the population consists of representatives of other nations (Russians and others). In view of this fact, no single one of these cities can be converted into a special national okrug or rayon. Moreover, not all of the populated places in which the Jewish mountaineers live can support even a national secondary school, owing to the small number of Jewish mountaineers living close together. However, despite their dispersion and limited numbers (26,000), the Jewish mountaineers are only very slowly and to a small degree merging with other peoples. (About 14,000 Jewish mountaineers live in Dagestan. Some of them work on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Southern Dagestan, and are employed in viniculture and the wine industry.) This is due to numerous causes. First, the primitive method of tanning and processing hides, at which the Jewish mountaineers have been

employed for centuries, has not been squeezed out by the industrial method. It is clear, however, that in the process of the further development of industry and expansion of Soviet trade, the Jewish mountaineers will be brought into industry as workers, and will gradually begin to merge with other nations.

Second, in the towns in which the Jewish mountaineers live, there is no kindred language (the Jewish mountaineers speak Tatian) or religion (Judaism) of the people, a fact which also hinders the process of the merger of the Jewish mountaineers with other nationalities and nations.

The process of the merger of small nationalities with larger nationalities or nations which is taking place in the USSR, goes ahead especially rapidly if the neighboring peoples have closely related languages and religious rites. For example, the small nationality of the Ak-Nogaytsy is merging with the Kumyks, who are close to them in terms of language and religions; while the Kara-Notaytsy live in some insulation from the peoples related to them, with the result that in their case consolidation is reduced to the isolated instances typical of all peoples.

Thus, a socialist nation is characterized by a stable community of economic life (the presence of an industrial center and a working class), territory, culture, and community of language expressed in the preponderance of the common national language over the dialects; while a nationality is characterized by the lack of an industrial center and a working class, which renders impossible a stable community of language and the other factors typical of nations. Consolidation does not in every case lead to the formation of a nation. In those cases where there is no industrial base it may lead only to a certain increase in the size of the nationality. Consequently, not every consolidation may be considered as the groundwork for the development of a nation.

In my view, the process of the qualitative changing of a nationality and its transformation into a nation begins only with the development of an industrial center and a working class. For example, the expansion of the coal, petroleum, diamond, and other industries on the huge territory of the Yakutskaya ASSR gave rise to large industrial centers,

workers' settlements, cities, institutes, a university, an affiliate of the Academy of Sciences USSR, scientific cadres, etc. These developments provide grounds for the view that the Yakutskaya socialist nationality is becoming a nation.

However, not all nationalities can furnish industry with a local labor force, owing to the small size of the population. Such nationalities merge sooner with other nationalities and nations. The process of the formation of a socialist nation takes place within the framework of the overall economic and political unity of friendly peoples; and as a result, this process also prepares their rapprochement and merger. Apparently, those nations which are young and related to one another begin to merge into a single nation sooner than do older and non-related nations. However, a more definite and incontrovertible fact is that a socialist nationality is not so long-lived as a socialist nation.

Appendices

Resume of Data on the Size, Territory and Languages of the Peoples of the USSR (Based on the 1939 Census)

The Indo-European Peoples of the USSR.

The Russians inhabit the territory of the RSFSR and cities of the union and autonomous republics of the Soviet Union. The Russian people comprises 99,019,900 persons. Individual groups of Russians also live beyond the boundaries of the USSR. Together with the Ukrainian and Belorussian languages, Russian belongs to the Eastern group of the Slavic branch of the Indo-European family of languages. The Russian language is divided into the following dialects and sub-dialects: Northern, Central (Moscow), and Southern. The Northern group of dialects is characterized by a hard (explosive) g sound, and a hard pronunciation of the t sound at the end of a verb in the third person (idet, idut), and other peculiarities. The Southern group is characterized

by a soft (fricative, flowing) g sound close to the Ukrainian pronunciation of g, and a soft t at the end of verbs in the third person (idet', idut'). The Northern groups retain the basic sound of o when that letter is in unstressed position / okat' /, while the Southern groups pronounce it as an a in that position / akat' /. The Middle Russian (Central, or Moscow) dialect combines certain features of the Northern and Southern dialects. This trait of the Moscow dialect apparently developed during the period of the formation of the central (Moscow) all-Russian market. The intermediate character of the Moscow dialect and its closeness to the Southern and Northern dialects accelerated the process of the formation of the Russian literary language associated with the development of capitalism in Russia. Following the Great October Socialist Revolution there was a considerable rise in the international political and spiritual prestige of the Russian people. Today all of the peoples of the USSR use Russian as an international language among the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The Russian socialist nation is the most advanced nation in the world, and has created a literature, a science, and a technology of world-historic importance.

The Ukrainians. The basic mass of the Ukrainians inhabit the territory of the UkrSSR. They also live in the BSSR, the Northern Caucasus, Siberia, Kazakhstan, and beyond the borders of the USSR. There are 35,611,000 Ukrainians in the USSR. The Kuban Kazakhi, the Gutsuly, the Boyki, and the Lemki all speak Ukrainian; but their dialects have distinguishing traits. The Ukrainian bourgeois nation was formed somewhat later than the Russian. In the process of the elimination of the exploiter classes and their nationalistic parties in the course of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and in the process of building socialism, of industrialization, and of collectivization, the Ukrainian bourgeois nations became a monolithic socialist nation.

The Belorussians constitute a socialist nation inhabiting the BSSR. They are the most monolithic of the Eastern Slavic nations. There are 8,700,000 Belorussians in the USSR. Their language is Belorussian. In view of the density of the population, the differences between the Northeastern and Southwestern dialects are very slight.

The Poles. As a nation, formed on the territory of Poland. Sizeable groups of Poles inhabit the Western regions of the BSSR, the UkrSSR, and the LiSSR. There are 626,900 Poles in the USSR.

The Czecks and Slovaks. The Czech and Slovak nations were formed on the territory of Czechia. The USSR contains small groups of Czechs and Slovaks numbering 26,900 persons.

The Lithuanians constitute a socialist nation. The basic mass of Lithuanians inhabit the territory of the LiSSR. Certain groups of Lithuanians live in the United States, Canada, and South America. There are more than 2,400,000 Lithuanians in the USSR. The Lithuanian language is one of the languages of the Baltic group of the Indo-European family manifesting a close relationship to the Eastern Slavic languages. A relative degree of singularity has been preserved by the dialects (the Zhamaytskiy in the Northwest, the Dzukskiy in the Southeast, and the Eastern Aukshaytskiy in the Northeast of the LiSSR).

The Latvians constitute a socialist nation. The basic population of the LaSSR. Total population: about 1,800,000. Some 1,600,000 persons live in the territory of the USSR, while the remainder live beyond the borders of the USSR. The Latvian language belongs to the Baltic group of the Indo-European languages, and has three dialects: Central Latvian, Upper Latvian (the eastern part of the LaSSR), and a dialect with noticeable traces of the Livian language which includes the speech of the Northwestern Kurzem and the western part of the Vidzem.

The Moldavians constitute a socialist nation. The basic population of the Moldavian USSR. A part of the Moldavians live in northern Rumania. There are 1,800,000 Moldavians in the USSR. The Moldavian language is related to the Romance group of Indo-European languages, but it contains a considerable number of Slavic words.

The Greeks. They live in the southern cities of the RSFSR and the UkrSSR. There are 285,900 Greeks in the USSR. They speak Russian, Greek, and Turkish (those who originate from Turkey).

Western Jews. There are about 17 million Western Jews in the world. Three million of them live in the USSR. They are scattered throughout the territory of the Soviet

Union. The Western Jews speak German and Spanish, plus the language of those peoples among whom they live. Their religion is Judaism.

The Indo-Iranian Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Ossets (Irons) constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Severo-Osetinskaya ASSR and the Osetinskaya Autonomous Oblast of the GSSR. The Northern Ossets are divided into the Irons and the Digortsy. The nationality comprises 357,000 persons. The Ossetian language belongs to the Iranian group.

The Tats constitute a socialist nationality inhabiting the territory of the AzSSR and the Dagestanskaya ASSR. Outside of the USSR, they live in Iran. There are 28,700 Tats in the USSR. The Tatian language belongs to the Western group of the Iranian languages. The Tats are Moslems (Shiites), except for the inhabitants of two Tatian settlements which are of the Armenian-Gregorian faith. (Some authors regard the Tats as Armenians.)

The Jewish Mountaineers inhabit the AzSSR, Derbent, the Caucasus Minor, Khasavyurt, Groznyy, Mozdok, Nal'chik, and Kizlyar. This socialist nationality comprises 25,000 persons. The language is of the Iranian group. They practice Judaism.

The Talyshi constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the southern part of the AzSSR. There are 77,000 Talyshi. The Talysh language belongs to the Iranian group.

The Kurds. The Kurdish nationality is divided into many groups. They are dispersed through Iran, Iraq, Syria and Turkey. The Total number of Kurds is 8 million. In the USSR there are 76,000 Kurds and 15,000 Kurd-Ezids. The Kurdish language belongs to the Iranian group and has dialects. Their dispersion has not prevented the Kurds from retaining their identity as a nationality.

The Tadzhiks constitute a socialist nation. They inhabit the territory of the TaSSR and the UzSSR. There are 1,230,000 Tadzhiks. Their language belongs to the Iranian group of the Indo-European family. The Tadzhiks are divided into plains dwellers and mountaineers (several multiples of ten thousand). In the process of the formation

of the Tadzhik socialist nation the following peoples of the Pamir region merged with them: the Yazzgulemtsy (2,000), the Shugnantsy (21,000), the Vakhatsy (4,500), the Yagnobtsy (2,500), and others. There are also Tadzhiks in Afghanistan (2.1 million), Iran (25,000), and a small number in the Uygursky [?] region of the People's Republic of China.

The Persians (Iranians). There are 32,300 Iranians in the USSR. There are also small groups of Hindus, Afghans, and other peoples speaking Iranian languages.

The Gypsies are a people with a nomadic way of life originating from India. Their language belongs to the modern Indian group. Gypsies are found in all countries of the world except Japan. They total from two to three million persons. There are about 60,000 Gypsies in the USSR.

The Armenians constitute a socialist nation. The basic population of the ArSSR. There are also Armenians living in the GSSR and the AzSSR. Outside of the USSR they are to be found in the countries of the Near East, France, the United States, and elsewhere. There are 2.4 million Armenians in the USSR. The Armenian language belongs to the Indo-European group, but it contains many elements in common with the Iberian-Caucasian languages. It has dialects and sub-dialects. In terms of their culture and local dialects, the Armenians are divided into the following basic groups: 1) the Armenians of the Ararat Valley, whose language forms the foundation for the modern literary language; 2) the Eastern Armenians; 3) the Western Armenians; 4) the Southern and Soutwestern Armenians.

The Iberian-Caucasian Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Abkhazy (Aysula) constitute a socialist nationality. There are 50,000 persons inhabiting the Abkhaskaya ASSR. Some of the Abkhazy live in Turkey. Their Abkhazian language belongs to the Abkhazo-Circassian branch of the Iberian-Caucasian languages.

The Abazintsy (Abaza) constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Cherkesskaya and Adygeyskaya autonomous oblasts. There are about 20,000 Abazintsy. The Abazinian language belongs to the Abkhazo-Circassian branch of the Iberian-Caucasian language.

The Adygetsy (Adyge or Circassians) constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Adygeyskaya and Cherkesskaya autonomous oblasts. There are 88,000 Adygeytsy in the USSR. In 1861, 100,000 of them migrated to Turkey. The language belongs to the Abkhazo-Circassian branch of the Iberian-Caucasian family.

The Georgians (Kartveli) constitute a socialist nation. The basic population of the GSSR. They are also found in the AzSSR, Turkey, and Iran. There are 2,248,000 Georgians in the USSR. The language belongs to the Karvelian group of the Iberian-Caucasian family. The main dialects are Kartayskiy, Kakhetinskiy, Pshavskiy, Khevusrskiy, Imeretinskiy, etc.

The Dagestan Group of the Iberian-Caucasian Peoples of the USSR

The Avartsy constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Dagestanskaya ASSR and to some extent the AzSSR. The language of the Avartsy, like that of the other peoples of Dagestan, belongs to the Dagestan group of the Iberian-Caucasian family. The Andiyskaya and Didoyskaya groups of nationalities are closely related to the Avartsy. This nationality numbers about 200,000 persons.

The Dartintsy constitute a socialist nationality inhabiting Northern Dagestan. There are more than 125,000 Dartintsy. Two small nationalities, the Kaytaki (Upper) and Kubachintsy, are close to the Dartintsy. Following the Great October Socialist Revolutions these groups were consolidated into a single nationality. The language of the Dartintsy belongs to the Dagestan group of the Iberian-Caucasian family.

The Laktsy (Laki, Kazi-Kumukhtsy) constitute one of the basic socialist nationalities of the Dagestanskaya ASSR. They number about 40,000 persons. The Lakian language belongs to the Dagestan branch of the Iberian-Caucasian family.

The Lezginy (Korintsy) constitute a socialist nationality. They live mostly in the southern part of the Dagestanskaya ASSR and partially in the northern part of the AzSSR. The nationality comprises 180,000 persons. Their language

belongs to the Dagestan group of the Iberian-Caucasian family. Linguistically and culturally, the Lezginy are close to several related nationalities, each of which has its own language: the Tabasarantsy, the Aguly, the Rutuly, the Tsakhury, the Khinalugi, the Budukhi, the Khaputlintsy, the Kryzgi, the Dzheki, and the Udiny.

The Chechens constitute a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Chechen-Ingushskaya ASSR. The nationality numbers 408,000 persons. The Chechens include the Aukhovtsy. Their language belongs to the Veynakhskaya group of the Northeastern Indo-European "Japhetic" family. It has dialects.

The Ingushi constitute a socialist nationality inhabiting the Chechen-Ingushskaya ASSR. The nationality comprises 92,000 persons. In terms of language and origin, the Ingushi and Chechens are very closely related. The languages of the Ingushi and Chechens, together with the languages of the small nationalities of the Batsbi (Tsovedi-Tushi) and Kistini in the mountainous part of Georgia, belong to the Veynakhskaya group of Northeastern Indo-European "Japhetic" languages. This group is close to the Dagestanian languages.

The Finno-Ugric Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Finns. The basic mass of Finns inhabits Finland (more than 4 million persons). There are 143,100 Finns (Suomi) in the USSR -- on the territory of the Karelskaya ASSR and the Leningradskaya Oblast. The so-called "Leningrad Finns" are closely related linguistically to the Finns (Sumoi).

The Izhortsy and the Vod' are nationalities closely related to the Leningrad Finns inhabiting the territory of the Leningradskaya Oblast. There are 16,000 Izhortsy and about 700 Vod'. Their languages belong to the Finno-Ugric group.

The Livy belong to the Finnish group, but are very strongly Latvianized. There are very few who speak the mother tongue (Livian).

The Estonians (Esty) constitute the basic population of the ESSR. The Estonian socialist nation comprises more than one million persons. Economically and culturally,

the Estonians have much in common with the Latvians and Lithuanians, but they differ from them linguistically. The Estonian language belongs to the Western Finnish branch of the Finnish group of the Finno-Ugric family. Linguistically, the Estonians are close to the Finns (Suomi) and Karelians, but culturally they are close to the Latvians and the Russians. The Estonian language is divided into Northern and Southern dialects.

The Karelians are a socialist nationality inhabiting the Karel'skaya ASSR and the upper course of the Volga. Outside the USSR, Karelians live in Finland. The Finnish Karelians are Lutherans, while the Soviet Karelians are Orthodox. There are 252,500 Karelians in the USSR, including 140,000 along the upper course of the Volga and 110,000 in the Karel'skaya ASSR. Their household language is Karelian, which belongs to the Finno-Ugric family, while their written languages are Russian and Finnish.

The Lopari. The basic mass of the Lopari is to be found in Norway (70 percent), Sweden (20 percent), and the USSR (5 percent). They total 35,000 persons. Foreign Lopari are Protestants, while those living in the USSR are Orthodox. Linguistically, the Lopari belong to the Northern branch of the Finnish group.

The Komi is the name of two related but independent nationalities, the Zyryane and the Permyaki, inhabiting the territory of the Komi ASSR. The languages of these two peoples, together with the language of the Udmurts, belong to the so-called "Permian" branch of the Finno-Ugric family. The Komi-Zyryane live in the basins of the rivers debouching into the Arctic Ocean (the Vychegda and its tributaries of the Kama (the In'ne, the Kose, etc.). The language of the Komi is divided into dialects. The nationality comprises 408,700 persons.

The Marytsy (Mari, Cheremisy). The Marytsy are divided into those inhabiting the mountains and those dwelling in meadowland areas. This socialist nationality comprises 481,000 persons. Most of them live in the Mariyskaya ASSR. They are also to be found in the Kirovskaya, Gor'kovskaya, and Sverdlovskaya oblasts, and in the Tatarskaya, Bashkirskaya, and Udmurtskaya republics. The language of the Marytsy belongs to the Volga group of the Finno-Ugric

family. It has numerous Tatar and Bashkirian words.

The Mordovians / or Mordvinians / In the course of the period of building socialism the Mordovian nationality has begun to develop into a socialist nation. Most of the Mordovians live in the Mordovskaya ASSR and in the republics and oblasts of the Povolzh'ye. The nationality comprises 1,450,000 persons. The Mordovian languages are divided into Mokshanskiy and Erzyanskiy, and belong to the Volga group of the Finno-Ugric family.

The Udmurts (Votyaki) are a socialist nationality. Most of them live in the Udmurtskaya ASSR, while a small number of Udmurts live in the Bashkirskaya ASSR. Their total number is 606,000 persons. The Udmurt language belongs to the Permian group and is divided into a Northern and a Southern dialect. Close to the Udmurts is a special ethnic group, the Besermane, who speak Udmurt. The word "besermane" corresponds to the words "barusmani" and "basurman," formed from the Arabic word "musul'man" (Moslem).

The Khanty (Ostyaki) are a nationality living in the Khanty-Mansiyskiy National Okrug (formerly the Ostyako-Vogul'skiy National Okrug) of the Tyumenskaya Oblast, RSFSR. There are about 18,000 Khanty. The language belongs to the Finno-Ugric family.

The Mamsi (Mam'si, Voguly) are a nationality inhabiting the Khanty-Mansiyskiy National Okrug, Tyumenskaya Oblast, RSFSR. They number more than 6,000. The language belongs to the Ugorskiy group of the Finno-Ugric family.

The Samoyed Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Samoyedic peoples speak Samoyed languages. Some investigators are of the opinion that the Samoyed languages are to some extent related to the Finno-Ugric family.

The Nentsy (Samoyeds, Yuraki) are a socialist nationality. There are 17,500 Nentsy. They live chiefly in the Nenetskiy National Okrug of the Arkhangel'skaya Oblast, the Yamalo-Nenetskiy National Okrug of the Tymenskaya Oblast, and in the western part of the Taymyrskiy National Okrug of the Krasnoyarskiy Kray. The language of the Nentsy belongs to the Samoyed group.

The Nganasany (Tavgiytsy, Nya) are a nationality

inhabiting the Taymyrskiy National Okrug, Karasnoyarskiy Kray, RSFSR. They number 800 persons. The language of the Nganasany belongs to the Samoyed group.

The Entsy (Madu, Pebay, Yeniseian Samoyeds). They live in the Taymyrskiy National Okrug, Krasnoyarskiy Kray, RSFSR. The language is of the Samoyed group. There are about 400 Entsy.

The Sel'kupy (Ostyako-Samoyeds) are a nationality living in the northern part of the Tomskaya Oblast and along the Taz River in the Yamalo-Nenetskiy National Okrug, with a population of more than 4,000. The language belongs to the Samoyed group.

The Kety (Yeniseian Ostyaki) are a nationality living in the Turukhanskiy and Yartsevskiy rayons of the Krasnoyarskiy Kray, RSFSR. Some investigators classify the language of the Kety with the Paleo-Asiatic group. There are 1,225 Kety.

The Paleo-Asiatic Peoples of the USSR

The Itel'meny (Kamchadalys) are a socialist nationality. They live on Kamchatka. The nationality comprises 4,000 persons. The greater part of the people has been mixed with Russians. About 800 persons have preserved the mother tongue.

The Koryaki (Mymylany) constitute the basic population of the Koryakskiy National Okrug of the Kamchatskaya Oblast, Khabarovskiy Kray, RSFSR. The size of the nationality is about 8,000.

The Chukchi constitute the basic population of the Chukotskiy National Okrug. The size of this socialist nationality is about 14,000.

The Yukagiry (Odul) are a small nationality of 2,000 persons, of which about 500 have retained their own language. They live in the northeastern part of the Yakutskaya ASSR and in the Khabarovskiy Kray.

The Gilyaki (Nivkhi). This nationality comprises 4,000 persons. They live near the mouth of the Amur River and on the island of Sakhalin.

The Chuvantsy live in the Chukotskiy and Koryakskiy okrugs. The size of this nationality is 700 persons.

The Eskimos (Innunty) are a nationality living all along the shore of the Arctic Ocean, from Greenland and Labrador to Alaska. The language of the Eskimos belongs to the "Paleo-Asiatic" family. There are about 40,000 Eskimos. A small number live in the USSR in the Chukotskiy National Okrug and on the islands of Wrangel and Great Diomede.

The Aleuts (Unantany) are a nationality living on the Aleutian Islands in the United States (5,600 persons as of 1939) and in the USSR --- on the Komandor Islands (353 persons). Their language is close to that of the Eskimos.

The Tungus-Manchu Group of Peoples

The Evenki (Tunguses) are a socialist nationality living in the Evenkiyskiy National Okrug of the Krasnoyarskiy Kray, the Irkutskaya Oblast, the Yakutskaya ASSR, the Khabarovskiy Kray, and the northern part of the Buryat-Mongol'skaya ASSR and the Chitinskaya Oblast. There are 40,000 Evenki. The language belongs to the Tungus-Manchu family. The Negidal'tsy are a distinct part of the Evenki. Their language is considered to be a dialect of that spoken by the Evenki. They number 450 persons. They live along the Amgun' River (a left tributary of the Amur) in the Khabarovskiy Kray.

The Nanaytsy (Gol'dy, Nani) constitute a nationality. They live along the Lower Amur, in the Khabarovskiy Kray, RSFSR, and in the People's Republic of China. There are more than 6,000 Nanaytsy on the territory of the USSR. The language belongs to the Tungus-Manchu group.

The Ul'chi (Ol'chi) constitute a nationality. They live on the Lower Amur, and number about 750 persons. The language of the UL'chi belongs to the Tungus-Manchu group.

The Orochi (Nani) are a nationality numbering 1,500 persons. They live in the southern part of the Khabarovskiy Kray. Their language belongs to the Tungus-Manchu group.

The Orok (Nani) are a small nationality living on Sakhalin Island. Their language is Tungus-Manchurian.

The Turkish-Speaking Peoples of the USSR

The Chuvashi constitute the basic population of the Chuvashskaya ASSR. The Chuvashi had begun to form into a nation as early as the turn of the century, but this process had not assumed a stable character. It was only during the period of the building of socialism that the Chuvashi were formed into a socialist nation. The total population of the nation is 1,369,000 persons. The Chuvash language belongs to the Turkish group, where it occupies a special position. The Chuvashi are divided into "Upper" and "Lower."

The Tatars. After the fall of the Golden Horde, five Tatar khanates were formed, being connected by military-trading communications: the Kasimov Khanate on the Oka River, the Kazan' Khanate, the Astrakhan' Khanate, the Crimean Khanate, and -- at a greater distance -- the Siberian Khanate with its center at Chingi-Tura (Tyumel'). From the 15th to the 18th Century, the Kasimov Khanate formed a part of the Russian state. The Kasimov Tatars were converted to Christianity, and a large number became Russianized. The modern city of Kasimov was the administrative center of the Kasimov Khanate. The largest group of Tatars -- the Kazan' Tatars -- began as early as the turn of this century to develop into a bourgeois nation, and during the Soviet Era they became a socialist nation. They inhabit the Tatarskaya ASSR and the northwestern part of the Bashkirskaya ASSR. The Astrakhan' Tatars are few in number and live in scattered groups along the lower course of the Volga. Small groups of Tatars live in the Tyumenskaya Oblast (the Tobol'skiye Tatars), the Novosibirskaya Oblast (the Barabinskiye Tatars), and other oblasts. The total number of Tatars is 4.3 million. Small groups of Golden Horde Tatars are found in Poland and Lithuania. The Tatars speak various dialects of the Tatar language of the Turkish group.

The Krymchaki. The Krymchaki, or Crimean Jews, speak the Crimean Tatar language. Their religion is Judaism. Small groups have survived.

The Karaimy. The basic population of the Karaimy is about 15,000. They live in Poland, Lithuania, the Crimea, and the Ukraine. The language of the Karaimy belongs to the Turkish group, and is divided into dialects. No literary

language has been formed. Together with their own language, they speak the language of the people among whom they live. Their religion is Judaism.

The Gagauzy are a nationality. The basic population lived in Bulgaria. In the 18th Century the Gagauzy migrated to Russia and now live in the Priazovskiy Rayon of the Zaporozhskaya Oblast, in Kazakhstan, and in the Northern Caucasus. There are 120,000 Gagauzy in the USSR. Their language is Turkish, and is similar to the Omsanskiy, but it contains many Slavisms. The Gagauzy are Orthodox.

The Nogaytsy. After the fall of the Golden Horde, at the end of the 14th Century, the Nogayskaya Horde migrated to the southern part of Russia. In the 16th Century the Nogaytsy came under Russian rule. Some of the Nogaytsy living in the southern part of the Ukraine migrated to Turkey in the 19th Century. The Nogaytsy live in the Cherkesskaya ASSR, the Groznenkaya Oblast (a considerable part of the "Kara-Nogaytsy"), and in the Dagestanskaya ASSR (the Ak-Nogaytsy). The overall population of this nationality is 36,300. The language of the Nogaytsy is Turkish and is closest to the Kara-Kalpak and Kazakh languages.

The Turkmen are a socialist nationality. At one time they were called "the Stavropol' Turkmen." In the early part of the 18th Century the Turkmen were driven out of Turkmen by the Kamyks. Their overall population is about 15,000. The language is Turkish. In the past it was one of the dialects of the Turkmen language.

The Balkartsy are a socialist nationality living in the Kabardino-Balkarskaya ASSR. Their total number is 43,000. The language is Turkish.

The Karachayevtsy are a socialist nationality living in the Karachayevskaya ASSR. Their language is Turkish. The total number of this nationality is 76,000.

The Kumyks are a socialist nationality living along the foothills of the Northeastern Caucasus from Mozdok to Derbent. Their total number is about 100,000. Prior to the spread of Russian among the mountain peoples, Kumyk served as the international language of Dagestan and Chechenia, thanks to the fact that the Kumyks lived at the junction of the roads connecting the summer (mountain) and winter (steppe) grazing lands and the trade routes going from North

to South along the foothills of the Northeastern Caucasus and the littoral of the Caspian. The Northern Kumyks (about 40,000) are linguistically homogeneous and have created the foundations for a Kumyk literary language. The Kumyk language of the Makhachkalinskiye, Buynakskiye, and Khaydakskiye Kumyks has its own subdialects and is not so monolithic as the idiom of the Northern (Khasavyurtovskiye) Kumyks. The Kumyk language combines the traits of two large groups of Turkish languages (the Kypchak and Oguz); and this testifies to the fact that the Kumyks had begun to take form as a nationality, even before the fall of the Golden Horde, from among the Turkish-speaking Kypchak and Oguz tribes. (It should be noted that the ethnographic literature continues to repeat N. Ya. Marr's statement that the Kumyks are linguistically separated oturechennyye Lezginy. (This statement is mistakenly attributed to V. V. Bartol'd, who took it from Marr without citing the source.) In this connection they ignore the question as to who linguistically separated the Lezginy, and how. They could not have separated by themselves. Moreover, the Turkish elements must have preponderated quantitatively over the linguistically separated Lezginy.)

A study of the ethnic makeup of the Kumyk nationality reveals that the Northern Kumyks include representatives of the Kabardintsy, Chechens, Guyens, Tyumens, Terkemen, Tatars, and other nationalities, while the Central Kumyks included Avartsy, Padary, and others, and the Southern Kumyks included Dartintsy, Turkmen, and others.

In the process of socialist building, the consolidation of the various groups of Kumyks has been accelerated; but the literary language does not yet predominate over the dialects.

The Terkeme are a socialist nationality living in Southern Dagestan (around Derbent), Azerbaydzhan, Georgia, and Armenia. "Terkeme" is a corruption of the Iranian word "tarkama";, i.e., "Turkmen." The Terkeme are vestiges of the Transcaucasian Turkmen, known in history as the Akkolyunlu and the Kara Koyunlu. The nationality comprises 10,000 persons. The language is Turkish, and close to Azerbaijani.

The Azerbaijanis are a socialist nation constituting the basic population of the AzSSR. Some of the Azerbaijanis

live in Iran. The total number of Azerbaijanis in the USSR is 2,274,800. The Azerbaijani language belongs to the Southern group of the Turkish languages. It has dialects. The Padary, Maguly, and other small Turkish-speaking peoples living in the AzSSR are merging with the Azerbaijani socialist nation.

The Bashkirs became a socialist nation during the period of socialist building in the USSR. They constitute the basic population of the Bashkirskaya ASSR. The Bashkir language belongs to the Turkish group. The total number of Bashkirs is 843,000.

The Kazakhs constitute a socialist nation and the basic population of the KaSSR. The Kazakh people comprises about 3,100,000 persons. The Kazakh language is monolithic and belongs to the Kapchak group of Turkish languages.

The Karakalpaks are a socialist nationality, and constitute the basic population of the Karkalpakska ASSR. In the 18th Century the Karakalpaks were compelled to leave the basin of the Syr-Dar'ya, and resettled in Central Asia, where they formed three groups: the Amudar'inskaya, Ferganskaya, and Zeravshanskaya. The language is Turkish, and close to that of the Nogaytsy and the Kazakhs. It has dialects. The Karkalpak nationality is developing into a socialist nation. It comprises 185,800 persons.

The Uzbeks are a socialist nation constituting the basic population of the UzSSR. They are also to be found in the Tadzhik, Kirgiz, and Turkmen union republics. The Uzbek people comprises 4,845,100 persons. The Uzbek literary language is one of the most refined of the Turkish languages. It has dialects.

Outside the USSR the Uzbeks live in Afghanistan, Sinchiang (China), Pakistan, and Northern India.

The Turkmen constitute the basic population of the TuSSR. They also live in the KaSSR, the UzSSR, the KiSSR, and the Karakalpakska ASSR. Outside the USSR they live chiefly in Afghanistan and Iran. The total number of Turkmen in the USSR is 812,400. The Turkmen language belongs to the Southwestern group of the Turkish languages, and has dialects. Lack of political organization, economic backwardness, and the colonial policy of Russian czarism hindered the formation of national unity. It was only after the Great

October Socialist Revolution that they became a nation.

The Kirgiz are a socialist nation constituting the basic population of the KISSR. A portion of the Kirgiz people lives in China. There are 884,000 Kirgiz in the USSR. The language of the Kirgiz is Turkish, and is close to the Kazakh language. It has dialects. A literary language has been established.

The Yakuts are a socialist nationality currently developing into a socialist nation. They constitute the basic population of the Yakutskaya ASSR. There are 242,000 Yakuts. The Yakut language is monolithic, with no dialects. It differs from the other Turkish languages by its local peculiarities and the presence of Mongolian and other elements borrowed from neighboring languages.

The Dolgany are a socialist nationality living in the Taymyrskiy National Okrug. There are 1,400 Dolgany. The language is regarded as a dialect of the Yakut language.

The Altaytsy (Oyrot) are a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Gorno-Altayskaya Autonomous Oblast, Altayskiy Kray, RSFSR. They are divided into Northern and Southern, which in turn are subdivided into three groups. There are 47,700 Altaytsy. Their language is Turkish non-monolithic, and close to the Kirgiz language.

The Khakasy (Abakanskiye Tatars) are a socialist nationality. They inhabit the Khakasskaya Autonomous Oblast and number 52,600 persons. Their language is Turkish, and has dialects.

The Shortsy (Kuznetskiye Tatars) are a socialist nationality living in the south of the Kemerovskaya Oblast, RSFSR, and numbering about 12,000 persons. Their language is regarded as a dialect of the language of the Khakasy.

The Shulymtsy are a socialist nationality inhabiting the bank of the Chulym River in the Tomskaya Oblast and numbering 11,000 persons. Their language is Turkish.

The Karagasy (Tofalary) are a small Turkish-language socialist nationality inhabiting the Irkutskaya Oblast and numbering 500 persons.

The Tuvintsy (Soyoty, Uryan-Khaytsy) are a socialist nationality constituting the basic population of the Tuvin-skaya Autonomous Oblast. Outside the USSR they live in the Mongolian People's Republic. There are 65,000 Tuvintsy in

the USSR. Their language is Turkish.

The Uygurs are a socialist nationality. A considerable part of the Uygurs (several million) live in China. In the USSR they live in the KaSSR, KiSSR, UzSSR, and TuSSR. There are more than 100,000 Uygurs in the USSR. There are many local names for the Uygurs in different areas ("Kashkarlyk," "Aksulau," "Loplyk," etc.).

The Mongolian Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Buryats are a socialist nationality constituting the basic population of the Buryat-Mongol'skaya ASSR. They also live in the Chitinskaya and Irkutskaya oblasts. The people numbers 238,000. The Buryat language belongs to the Mongolian group. About 60,000 Buryats live in the Mongolian People's Republic.

The Sart-Kalmaks (Mongols). They live in the KiSSR, and number 3,500 persons. The language is Mongolian. However, a large percentage of the people use the Kirghiz language, and only the older generation remembers the Mongolian language.

The Kalmyks are a socialist nationality constituting the basic population of the Kalmykskaya Autonomous Oblast and numbering 134,000 persons. Their language belongs to the Mongolian group.

The Semitic Group of Peoples of the USSR

The Arabs of the Uzbekskaya SSR. The basic mass of Arabs lives in Egypt, Syria, Israel, Lebanon, and Iraq. In the USSR they live in the UzSSR. There are 22,000 Arabs in the USSR.

The Aysory (Surai) are Assyrians. Most of them live in Turkey (863,000) and Iran (76,000). There are about 20,000 Aysory in the USSR. For the most part, they live in large cities, and also in the Transcaucasus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

K. Marx, "A Summary of L. Morgan's book, 'Ancient Society.'" "Arkhiv Marks'a i Engel'sa" [Marx and Engels Archives] Vol V, 1945.

F. Engels, "The Dialectics of Nature," L, 1948, pp 135-140.

Idem, "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," M, 1951, pp 93, 97, 101-102.

V. I. Lenin, "Critical Comments on the National Question," "Works," Vol 20, -- 1-34.

Idem, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," "Works," Vol 20, pp 365-424.

Idem, "The National Pride of the Great Russians," "Works," Vol 21, pp 84-88.

Idem, "What are the 'Friends of the People' and How do They Combat the Social Democrats?," "Works," Vol 1, pp 137-138.

I. V. Stalin, "Marxism and the National Question," "Works," Vol 2, pp 292, 303.

Idem, "The National Question and Leninism," "Works," Vol 11, p 336.

Artamonov, M. I., "The Origin of the Slavs," L, 1950.

"Baltic Ethnographic Data," Vol 32, 'Works of the Institute of Ethnography,' M, 1956.

Balandin, D. N. (and others), "Northern Ossetia," Ordzhonikidze, 1939.

Barannikov, A. P., "The Gypsies of the USSR: A Brief Histo-
rico-Ethnographic Outline," M, Tsentrizdat, 1931.

Belitser, V. N., "The Problem of the Origin of the Beser-
myany," Vol 1, "Works of the Institute of Ethnography," Izd. AN SSSR, 1947.

Butenko, A. P., "A People as a Sociological Category," Voprosy Filosofii, 1957, No 1.

"Problems of the Ethnic History of the Estonian People," a selection of articles edited by Kh. A. Moor, Tallin, 1956.

"The All-Union Census of the Population for 1926." Vols I-VI, TsU, USSR, M, 1928-33.

Darwin, Ch., "The Origin of Man and Sexual Selection," "Works," Vol 5, M, 1956, p 265.

Dmitriyev, S. S., "The Formation of the Russian Nation," "Voprosy Istorii," 1951, No 7.

"The Ancient Slavs in Excerpts from Greco-Roman and Byzantine Writers in the Sixth Century A.D.," VDI, 1941, No 1.

Yefimenko, A. Ya., "A History of the Ukrainian People," Part 12, St. Petersburg, 1906.

Zhitov, K., "A Brief History of the Uzbekskaya SSR," Tashkent, 1947.

Zarubin, I. I., "A List of the Nationalities of the USSR," L, 1927.

"A History of Georgia," Part 1, Tbilisi, 1946.

"A History of the Armenian People," Yerevan, Izd. An ArSSR, 1944.

"A History of Azerbayjan: A Brief Outline," Baku, Izd. Azerbaydzhanskoi FAN SSSR, 1943.

"A History of the Latvian SSR," Vol 1, Riga, 1952.

"A History of Siberia," Parts 1-2, M-L, Izd. AN SSSR, 1937-51.

"A History of the Culture of Ancient Russia," Vols. I-II, M-L, 1948-51.

Kudryavtsev, F. A., "A History of the Buryat-Mongolian People," M, 1940.

Mavrodin, V. V., "Basic Stages in the Ethnic Development of the Russian People," "Voprosy Istorii," 1950, No 4.

Maksimov, A. N., "What Peoples Live in Russia," M, 1919.

"The Peoples of Dagestan," a selection of articles, M, 1955.

Nestrukh, M. F., "The Human Race," M, Uchpedgiz, 1954.

"Essays on the History of the Tadzhiks and Tadzhikistan," Stalinabad, 1941.

"Essays on the History of the Kazakhskaya SSR," Alma-Ata, 1948.

"A Description of All of the Peoples Inhabiting the Russian State," Vol 1-4, 2nd Edition, St. Petersburg, 1799.

Pisarev, I. K., "The Results of the 1939 Census in the USSR." "Problemy Ekonomiki," 1940, No 7.

Picheta, V., "The Formation of the Belorussian People," "Voprosy Istorii," 1946, Nos 5-6.

Plisetskiy, M. S., "Man and His Races," M, Goskul'tprosvet-izdat, 1956.

"The Race Problem and Society," A selection of translations from the French, edited and with an introduction by M. S. Plisetskiy, M, Il, 1957.

"The Religious Beliefs of the Peoples of the USSR," M, 1931.
Rybakhov, B. A., "The Ancient Russians," "Sovetskaya
Arkheologiya," Vol XVII, 1953.
Satybalov, A. A. and Popov, A. N., "Ariak-Arian," "Vestnik
LGU," 1956, No 8, 2.
Smirnov, A. N., "Essays on the Ancient History of the Peoples
of the Middle Povolzh'ye and the Prikam'ye," MIA,
M, 1952, No 28.
"The Socialist Nations of the USSR," M, Gospolitizdat, 1955.
Struve, V. V., "The Aryan Problem," "Sovetskaya Etnografiya,"
Vols VI and VII, M-L, 1947.
Sul'kevich, S. I., "The Population of the USSR: Results of
the 1939 Census," M, 1939.
Tokarev, S. A., "Essays on the History of the Yakut People,"
M, 1940.
Idem, "The Peoples of the USSR," Izd. MGU, 1958.
Trofimov, T. A., "The Tobol'skiye and Barabinskiye Tatars,"
Vol 1, Works of the Institute of Ethnography, M, 1947.
Shakhmatov, A. A., "The Problem of the Formation of the
Russians and the Russian Nationalities," ZhMNP, 1899,
Vol IV.
Cheboksarov, N. N., "The Problem of the Origin of the Peoples
of the Finno-Ugric Language Group," "Sovetskaya
Etnografiya," 1952, No 1.
Idem, "Problems of the Ethnogenesis of the Peoples of the
Soviet Baltic Region in the Light of the Data of
Ethnography and Anthropology," PEKS, 1950, Vol XII.
Yakubinskiy, L. P., "The Formation of Nationalities and
Their Languages," "Vestnik LGU," 1947, No 1.

END